

VOLUME 23

AUTUMN 1951

NUMBER 4

Public Administration Review

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY
FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

The American Society for Public Administration

Principles, Processes, and Theory of Public Administration

JOHN M. GAUS, *President*

L. P. GOFFINGHAM, *Vice-President*

BERNARD BURCHFIELD, *Secretary-Treasurer*

THE COUNCIL

W. BOEHMAN

W. CORSON

W. DUNNINGHAM

JOSEPHUS TORO

W. DUBHAM

W. L. DURRICH

W. S. FLEMING

W. HAMILTON

W. HOEHLER

W. JOHNSON

ALBERT LEPAWETZ

ROBERT C. MARTIN

JOHN MCDIARMID

JAMES M. MITCHELL

BYRON PRICE

JOHN W. RUFLEY

DONALD C. STONE

M. L. WILSON

THE PRESIDENT

THE VICE PRESIDENT

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW

WALLACE S. SAYRE, *Editor-in-Chief*

BERNARD BURCHFIELD, *Managing Editor*

EDITORIAL BOARD

W. FISHER

W. J. HART

W. LEWIS

LYMAN S. MOORE

WILLIAM W. PIERCE

YOUNG Y. WILLIAMS

FRANCES H. WILLIAMS

The Secretariat for the Society
is located at the Public Administration Clearing House,
University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois. Don E. Price, Associate Director,
is a member of the Public Administration Clearing House and
the Society and managing editor of *Public Administration*.

Public Administration Review

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Volume XI AUTUMN 1951 Number 4

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-----|
| The "Servicio" in Theory and Practice | Kenneth R. Iverson | 223 |
| The Administrative Problems of a New State—Israel 1948-51 | The Hon. Edwin Samuel, C.M.G. | 229 |
| The Objectives of Governmental Reorganization | Marshall E. Dimock | 233 |
| Inventorying Files | Homer L. Calkin | 242 |
| Aspects of Local Government in England and Wales | Emmeline W. Cohen | 253 |
| Equalizing Library Services in New York State | Phillips Bradley | 260 |
| Problems of Top Management: A Panel Discussion | | 267 |
| Reviews of Books and Documents | | |
| Studies in the Administration of United States Foreign Affairs | Royden Dangerfield | 275 |
| <i>The Administration of American Foreign Affairs</i> , by James L. McCamy; <i>The Administration of Foreign Affairs and Overseas Operations; A Report Prepared for the Bureau of the Budget</i> , by the Brookings Institution; <i>United States Administration of Its International Economic Affairs</i> , by Wallace Judson Parks | | |
| Servant of a Purpose | Herman Finer | 282 |
| <i>Florence Nightingale: 1820-1910</i> , by Cecil Woodham-Smith | | |
| Contemporary Topics | | 287 |

Published quarterly, in February, May, August, and November, by the American Society for Public Administration, 1515 East 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois. Entered as second class matter February 7, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1897, with additional entry at Brattleboro, Vermont.

The contents of *Public Administration Review* are indexed in Public Affairs Information Service, International Index to Periodicals, and Index to Legal Periodicals. They are microfilmed by University Microfilms.

Subscriptions: \$6 a year. Single copies \$1.50. No discount to agents.

Annual membership dues: sustaining members \$10 or more; members \$6; junior members (those 28 years of age or under) \$3; student members \$3. Of the amount paid for membership dues, \$4.50 is allocated to the subscription to *Public Administration Review*. Address: American Society for Public Administration, 1515 East 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois.

... The second highest outlay in the municipal budget of major American cities is for the police department ...

... The most effective force in combating organized crime is effective police work on the local level ...

These reasons alone make the new book

Police Organization and Management

by V. A. LEONARD

a "must" for the public administrator, the police executive, the school of public administration.

POLICE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT demonstrates how the operating performance of the police force can be drastically improved by the application of modern standards, methods and procedures. It develops selection and training of personnel, planning for daily and emergency operations, efficient use of patrol and staff forces, etc. The ideal handbook on police administration ...

POLICE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT by V. A. Leonard, Chairman, Department of Police Science and Administration, State College of Washington 507 pages \$5.00

THE FOUNDATION PRESS, INC.

268 Flatbush Avenue Extension • Brooklyn 1, New York

Publishers of: THE CRIMINAL, by August Vollmer
ELEMENTS OF POLICE SCIENCE, by Rollin M. Perkins
POLICE EXAMINATIONS, by Rollin M. Perkins

READER IN BUREAUCRACY

Edited by Robert K. Merton, Ailsa P. Gray, Barbara Hockey, Hanan C. Selvin

Advisory Board: Chester I. Barnard, Reinhard Bendix, Marshall E. Dimock, Carl J. Friedrich, Pendleton Herring, Harold D. Lasswell, Talcott Parsons, Philip Selznick, Edward A. Shils, Herbert A. Simon, R. Richard Wohl.

Selected from the writings of

Max Weber, Carl J. Friedrich, Frederic S. Burin, Alvin W. Gouldner, Herbert A. Simon, T. F. Tout, Ernest Troeltsch, Thorstein Veblen, Robert Michels, Hans H. Gerth, Reinhard Bendix, Philip Selznick, Franz Neumann, Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Gardiner C. Means, Robert A. Gordon, C. Wright Mills, Chester I. Barnard, Robert Dubin, Carl Dreyfuss, F. J. Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson, Samuel A. Stouffer, Richard C. Myers, Marshall E. Dimock, The Hoover Commission, S. M. Lipset, J. Donald Kingsley, Karl Mannheim, Robert K. Merton, H. E. Dale, Ralph H. Turner, Arthur K. Davis, Walter R. Sharp, William Miller, Arthur W. MacMahon, John D. Millett, Howard K. Hyde, Edwin H. Sutherland, Sune Carlson, Harold D. Lasswell, Ralph M. Stogdill.

Published in December

\$5.00

ALSO:

GOVERNMENT PROJECT by EDWARD C. BANFIELD

\$3.50

THE POLITICAL WRITINGS OF HAROLD D. LASSWELL

\$5.00

REFLECTIONS ON VIOLENCE by GEORGES SOREL

\$3.50

ON TYRANNY by LEO STRAUSS

\$2.50

A STUDY OF POWER by CHARLES E. MERRIAM,

HAROLD D. LASSWELL and T. V. SMITH

\$6.00

PERSONALITY AND POLITICAL CRISIS edited by

ALFRED H. STANTON and STEWART E. PERRY

\$3.75

Published by THE FREE PRESS at Glencoe, Illinois

IN THIS NUMBER

KENNETH R. IVERSON has been president of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs since June, 1950. He was associated with the Institute from 1942-47, serving as general counsel during part of that period. From 1947-50 he was with the American Mission for Aid to Greece. He received an LL.B. degree from George Washington University Law School in 1934, and was an attorney in the Office of the Solicitor, U.S. Department of Agriculture, from 1934-42.

THE HON. EDWIN SAMUEL, C.M.G., principal of the Institute of Public Administration in Israel, was a member of the Palestine Civil Service from 1920-48. Among positions he held were assistant secretary, Government of Palestine, 1927-30; assistant district commissioner of Galilee, 1933-34; deputy commissioner for migration, 1934-39; postal and telegraph censor, Jerusalem, 1939-42; chief censor and (from 1944) press censor, 1942-45; director of broadcasting, 1945-48. He is the author of *The Theory of Administration*, *Handbook of the Jewish Communal Villages*, and *The Administration of Palestine under British Mandate, 1920-48*.

MARSHALL E. DIMOCK is visiting professor of public policy and administration, Florida State University. He has taught at the University of California at Los Angeles, the University of Chicago, and Northwestern University. He was second assistant secretary of labor, 1938-40; associate commissioner of immigration and naturalization, 1940-42; and assistant deputy administrator, War Shipping Administration, 1942-44. His books include *Government Operated Enterprises in the Panama Canal Zone*, *Developing America's Waterways*, *The Executive in Action*, and *Free Enterprise and the Administrative State*.

HOMER L. CALKIN is assistant records management officer, U.S. Department of State and the Foreign Service. He has held the positions of organizations and propaganda analyst, Department of Justice; intelligence officer, War Department General Staff; and archivist, National Archives. He has a Ph.D. from the State University of Iowa.

EMMELINE W. COHEN has been research and information officer, Institute of Public Administration, since 1949. She worked in the reference division, British Information Services, New York, 1947-49, and served in the Ministry of Supply during World War II. She is the author of *The Growth of the British Civil Service 1780-1939* and *English Social Services*.

PHILLIPS BRADLEY, professor of political science, Syracuse University, has taught at a number of colleges and universities. He was professor of political science and director of the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Illinois, from 1946-50. He was a trustee of the Queens Borough Public Library, 1939-46, and a member of the trustees division of the executive division of the American Library Association, 1943-44, and second vice chairman, 1944-45.

ROYDEN DANGERFIELD is professor of political science and director of the Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois. He was chief, Blockade Division, Foreign Economic Administration, 1942-44; Lt. Commander, U.S.N.R., chief international law officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, 1944-45; assistant chief, Division of Research and Publications, Department of State, 1945; consultant, Bureau of the Budget, 1948; and consultant, Economic Cooperation Administration, 1948, 1951. He has his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, and has taught at the Universities of Oklahoma and Wisconsin.

HERMAN FINER during 1950-51 was director of the Kellogg Foundation Research Project into the Application of Administration and Social Science to Education of Nurse-Administrators. He is a professor of political science, the University of Chicago, and for many years was a reader in public administration at the University of London. He is the author of *The Theory and Practice of Modern Government*, *English Local Government*, and *The British Civil Service*.

CHANGES OF ADDRESS

Will members please notify us promptly of any changes of address? If you are moving will you please send a postal card with your old and new addresses or a Post Office Form 22-S to Public Administration Review, 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois. Be sure to indicate the zone number in your new address.

Public Administration Review is intended to promote the exchange of ideas among public officials and students of administration. The various views of public policy and public administration expressed herein are the private opinions of the authors; they do not necessarily reflect the official views of the agencies for which they work or the opinions of the editors of this journal.

The "Servicio" in Theory and Practice

By KENNETH R. IVERSON

*President, The Institute of Inter-American Affairs
(A U.S. Government Point IV Agency)*

I

THE public release of the report to the President, *Partners in Progress*, prepared by the International Development Advisory Board, which recommended a worldwide economic development program, has focused interest on the existing pattern of United States technical assistance programs abroad. This report, prepared by a group of eminent Americans appointed by the President under the Act for International Development (Point IV program), is another indication of our country's determined effort to find a positive approach to the task we must face up to. In the words of the report, this task is "the strengthening of the economies of the underdeveloped regions and an improvement in their living levels" as "a vital part of our defense mobilization."

The International Development Advisory Board report recognized that The Institute of Inter-American Affairs had pioneered in establishing an effective technique for economic development, tested in the only crucible that can provide a realistic measurable gauge—experience and results. It recommended

... the creation of regional institutes for the Middle East, Africa, South Asia, and Southeast Asia similar to the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. These institutes should be used wherever practicable as the vehicle to set up joint "servicio" units with other governments to carry out cooperative jointly financed programs in the fields of health and sanitation, agriculture, education, and public administration. (p. 68)

The key word in the board's statement is *servicio*. Why a *servicio*? How does it originate? How does it work? What are its results?

Servicio is the generic name of the adminis-

trative device through which the Institute works with the other American Republics in the execution of technical assistance or basic economic development programs. The Spanish word *servicio* means service; it is also the synonym for government bureau in the United States. A cooperative *servicio* is a bureau or department of a ministry of a Latin American government, such as the ministry of agriculture, public health, or education.

The board's recommendation was based upon the results of over nine years of experience of The Institute of Inter-American Affairs in working with the governments and people of the other American Republics. These years were filled with study, thought, and experiment to determine how nations can successfully work together in solving basic economic problems. There were difficulties, disappointments, hard work, and slow but sure progress. Gradually these efforts resulted in tangible accomplishments that not only helped in the basic technical service fields, but also contributed in further cementing the friendships of the peoples and governments of the Western Hemisphere. This effort represents the experience of the personnel of many nations working together—the United States and eighteen of the other American Republics. This is a program of all these nations and their technicians, not the work of any single nation or people.

The Institute of Inter-American Affairs is a United States government corporation, attached to the Department of State, which represents the government of the United States in cooperative technical assistance activities with the other American Republics. The cooperative *servicio* concept developed by the American Republics and The Institute of Inter-

American Affairs has gained administrative support at the highest government levels in sovereign nations and also grass-roots support from the most depressed groups of people in these nations.

II

How did the *servicio* method come into being? Back in 1942 the world was at war and the United States and its Allies were working to strengthen themselves for the showdown. The Western Hemisphere required protection; United States and Allied soldiers were stationed in places in Latin America where malaria and other health problems had to be met if the men were to retain their fighting capacity. Our Allies and the civilian populations supporting them needed rubber, but the rubber trees in the Western Hemisphere were generally in isolated areas where there was no adequately organized medical assistance to handle grave health problems. Many strategic materials required for defense could be obtained only if the Latin American governments stepped up their production. Food production, too, had to be increased to meet the requirements resulting from lack of shipping and population dislocations. Governmental administrative structures needed strengthening.

The Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics meeting in Rio de Janeiro in January, 1942, agreed to cooperate with one another in the solution of these problems. But having adopted a policy of cooperation, the American Republics were faced with the question of how to proceed. The Institute of Inter-American Affairs was organized in 1942 to assist in handling these problems.

Immediately Nelson A. Rockefeller, the coordinator of the Office of Inter-American Affairs and president of the Institute, was confronted with the question of how best to proceed to assist the governments of the other American Republics to construct dikes, drain swamps, spray infested areas, provide new public health and sanitation facilities, expand agricultural activities and produce more food, and train administrators for public service—how in general to work with the governments of the other American Republics in the solution of these and other related problems.

If you were an official of the United States

government charged with these responsibilities how would you meet them? As you think of this question, keep in mind that

1. The work to be performed is in the other American Republics where you are a foreigner and the nation you represent is a foreign sovereignty.

2. The other American Republics are sovereign states as is the United States. If the situation of need were reversed, ask yourself how you would like to be approached as the recipient of aid.

3. The activities to be undertaken and the work to be done are the responsibilities of the American Republics, not the direct responsibility of the United States, but the United States is willing to respond to the request for assistance from its fellow Republics.

4. The programs involve expenditures of funds, the relationships of governments and people, problems of conflicts of law, and many matters of national and international relationships.

An examination of three of the principal methods by which nations can work together will demonstrate why a decision was reached to use the *servicio* method.

First, the United States can send advisers to consult with the representatives of other countries. In some instances the consultant has only advice to offer; in others his advice is coupled with funds to be made available, generally as grants, upon the condition that the country accepts and follows his advice. This method works well if the advice is followed, but sometimes advice is not accepted or is accepted only in part. If the advice is not accepted, the adviser can withdraw in humility and return home; but this does not get the job done. If the advice is accepted in part and the country he represents is satisfied to have only this part accepted and followed, the adviser can swallow his pride and remain. The Institute uses this advisory method only where joint operations are not required to accomplish certain desired results.

Second, the United States, on the basis of an understanding with another country, can have its officials perform the functions which it wants accomplished within that country. This is a direct government operation that puts the United States in business in a foreign

country. The United States followed this method in some fields during World War II. It is a serious question, however, whether the United States should go into business in the fields of construction, public health, agriculture, and transportation within the sovereign jurisdiction of another nation except under unusual circumstances such as exist during a world war.

Third, the United States can enter into a partnership arrangement with other countries and they can jointly undertake to execute programs through a *servicio*. This device incorporates the general advantages of the first two methods and avoids their inherent disadvantages. United States technicians, as members of the *servicio*, advise and work with officials and technicians of the other government, not as advisers and receivers of advice or by unilateral action but as partners.

A *servicio* is not like Topsy—it doesn't just grow by itself. It is the result of a series of premeditated steps taken by two governments. An American Republic requests assistance from the United States on a particular problem or in a general field of activity. After consideration and upon acceptance by the appropriate officials, the United States responds by sending an official of the Institute to negotiate, under the guidance of the American Ambassador, what is called a "basic agreement." In this agreement the American Republic undertakes to establish a *servicio* as a part of the ministry having jurisdiction over the particular activity—for example, agriculture, health, education. The government thereafter creates a *servicio*, by executive order or legislation or both, and vests in it appropriate powers and authority.

Thus, a *servicio* is born. It is an executive agency of a special or emergency nature, as distinguished from a permanent or constitutional ministry. It is endowed with special authority by the country which creates it and is endowed with special personnel by the cooperating countries. Inevitably, because of the intimate mingling of the two sets of personnel from two nations of somewhat different culture and living standards, the *servicio* is possessed of a special spirit and a new pattern for activity.

III

ALTHOUGH the *servicio* is a part of a ministry, it is autonomous in many respects. Its autonomy is derived from the authority vested in the director to determine, with the concurrence of the minister, the administrative procedures to be followed by the *servicio*. It has a special bank account over which it has jurisdiction. The *servicio* may be relieved, by the determination of the two partners, from most of the fiscal laws and regulations applicable to the regular branches of the ministry. It exists for the sole purpose of carrying out a program of development and improvement within the limits of the selected field of operations as planned, developed, and agreed to by the representatives of the two governments. The Latin American Republic is represented by the minister of the cooperating ministry and The Institute of Inter-American Affairs is represented by a chief of field party. The Institute sends to the American Republic such technicians as are required and names as the head of the group a chief of field party. The minister and the chief of field party are co-equals in developing the administrative technique to be followed by the *servicio*.

In order to make effective use of the administrative and technical skills of United States personnel, the basic agreement provides that the chief of field party shall be appointed director of the *servicio*. One man thus holds dual positions—as chief of field party he is an employee of the Institute; he is also director of the *servicio*. The Institute pays the salary and expenses of the chief of field party and no compensation is paid as director of the *servicio*.

The Constitution of the United States prohibits officials of the United States government from accepting honoraria, gratuities, or positions with foreign governments unless authorized by the Congress. Congress, however, has recognized the merits of the arrangement of having an official of the United States government appointed director of the *servicio*, and has given express authority to Institute officers and employees, when approved by the Institute, to accept and hold positions to which no compensation is attached with government agencies of the other American Republics.

The director of the *servicio* has authority to direct and administer its various activities. In most *servicios* he can hire and dismiss personnel, determine personnel policies, purchase materials required for *servicio* operations, expend *servicio* funds under project agreements, establish procedures for disbursement of funds and accounting, control *servicio* property, and handle all other administrative matters. The director obtains the concurrence of the minister on procedures for handling these problems, but the director has the initiative in developing them.

The autonomy of the *servicio* within the ministry has contributed much to the success of its operations. It has made possible the selection and retention of competent local personnel without regard to political affiliation, has prevented *servicio* programs from being used as "pork barrels," has permitted the planning of *servicio* undertakings with a view to maximum benefit to the country as a whole, and has relieved *servicio* operations of any inefficient government procedures. When governments have changed, either by peaceful or by violent methods, *servicios* have never ceased operations. In this respect they are making a fundamental contribution to the solution of one of the serious problems of Latin America—instability of government and lack of continuity in government programs.

The basic agreement delineates the problems a *servicio* is to attack and provides a broad general pattern for cooperation. The *servicio* organization and program are flexible and may be adapted to the needs of the ministry in which the program is to be developed. Thus no two *servicio* organizations or programs are exactly alike. Each *servicio* is a special vehicle built to fit the needs of a particular ministry and its program. This factor is recognized in the provision for joint planning. The minister and his staff know the needs of their country and people and what the ministry itself plans to do to meet them. The chief of field party and his staff are trained to plan programs and to determine the technical feasibility of proposals. *Servicio* program planning is, therefore, a process of pooling the knowledge of the two groups and developing a plan which, when the activities of the *servicio* are added to those of the min-

istry, will provide the most complete and best balanced program that available technical and financial resources will buy. Only through the full participation of the minister and his staff and the chief of field party and his staff can the most effective program be developed.

The Institute does not attempt to determine prior to the arrival of its representatives in the American Republic the specific projects or activities to be undertaken. Intelligent program planning requires a knowledge of the country, its physical resources, its people, the existing programs, and the interest and the objectives of the people and their government. It takes time for United States personnel to obtain information and background knowledge of a country. Once obtained, they and the minister and his staff can pool their training, experience, and knowledge in constructive bi-national program planning.

It is for these reasons that the Institute delegates to its chief of field party the authority to commit it to projects without requiring that project agreements be returned to Washington for approval by any Monday-morning strategists it might have. The chiefs of field party live up to the responsibility that is placed upon them. Institute headquarters personnel in Washington, however, establish certain policy guide lines, keep currently informed of programs, provide advisory assistance by correspondence and telephone, and make periodic trips to the various American Republics for the purpose of reviewing progress of the programs and their effectiveness. So long as a chief of field party and his staff perform effectively, they have the backing of the Washington headquarters.

From time to time it has been suggested in some quarters that the authority to make commitments should be reserved to Washington. The Institute is firm in its belief that more effective results can be obtained by having good personnel represent it in the other American Republics with full authority to act. The minister has authority to represent his government and the chief of field party must have equal authority if mutual confidence and respect are to develop. Responsibility, confidence, respect, and equal rights are the elements upon which a successful *servicio* relationship is established and maintained.

IV

WITH the authority to determine the details of programs vested in the representatives of the two governments, what types of activities are actually carried out? The cooperative programs have been primarily in the fields of health and sanitation, agricultural development, and education; public administration, transportation, and the stimulation of small industries have also received some attention. Care has been taken not to set up programs that compete with those already under way in the ministries. In general, the *servicio* program operates in pioneer fields not being explored by the regular departments of the government or by private enterprise. It also operates in fields where the regular departments may lack authority to carry out particular projects or money or technicians required to make such projects effective and in fields where the regular ministries are operating but desire assistance to make their activities more effective. The program is always geared to the needs of the particular situation.

Many projects involving construction, such as quarantine stations, warehouses, laboratories, hospitals, health centers, and water and sewer systems, can be transferred to a permanent government agency as it is prepared to take them over. Technical assistance may be provided for a short time after construction is completed to assure that the management is effective.

There are other projects, however, which are the basic tools for much that the *servicio* program is seeking to accomplish. In this group are projects like the farm extension services and the *servicio*-advised farm credit program. Through these projects the knowledge and skills of *servicio* technicians are made available to local farmers and the vital education programs for better farming and home management are undertaken. In this group are also the teacher training projects and the health education projects. These projects usually are not transferred until the ministry is adequately organized and is staffed with many more capable and trained technicians and administrators than are usually available. The project agreements include appropriate provisions for training the personnel that are needed.

Some projects undertaken by the *servicios* touch on private enterprise fields. As an example, organic insecticides were needed in a host country to help save a cotton crop. The *servicio* handled the importation and distribution of the insecticides. There was no commercial company in existence to handle the importation and there was no time to wait for one to be organized. But as a result of the *servicio's* action, a commercial concern was established to handle such imports the following year and the *servicio* did not have to repeat the project.

In the years in which the Institute has been cooperating with the American Republics through the *servicio* device, over 2,800 individual projects in the fields of health and sanitation alone have been started. At the appropriate time many of them have been transferred to the regular departments of government for normal operation.

In the *servicios* technicians of both countries work side by side, showing their skills in grafting plants, operating tractors, or building school blackboards and teaching the less skilled their know-how. Technicians from the United States seem to take pride in and enjoy performing all parts of their trade or profession even though they get their hands dirty and work without white shirt and tie. This is not the normal custom of the engineer, the agriculturist, and the professionals in all parts of the world. Experience has shown, however, that training carried on in the environment where people are to work has definite advantages. Education in new techniques shows lasting results when these techniques can be assimilated and developed as part of the local tradition. The nationals of the American Republics are absorbing the new methods and techniques brought to them. They are also developing their talents as administrators. People learn administration by participating in it, and the *servicio* employees are learning to run their services and administer their programs as they work side by side with their North American colleagues.

Other types of training are also important and the Institute has brought to the United States over 1,200 Latin Americans for formal training as public health doctors, sanitary engineers, nurses, agricultural technicians, and

educators. These persons have been selected for training so that they will be better equipped for jobs in the *servicios* and the ministries of their governments. They are performing an ever greater part in these programs.

The nationals of the Latin American Republics employed by the *servicios* far outnumber Institute personnel. At the last count there were about 250 United States technicians in eighteen Latin American countries and about 8,000 nationals employed in the *servicios*. In one typical agricultural *servicio* there are eleven North Americans and approximately 400 local technicians and trained personnel, not including laborers.

When the *servicio* programs were started in 1942, the United States was so desirous that certain work be undertaken without delay that the Institute generally financed the programs. The other American Republics soon saw the benefits of the work and began to make fund contributions. They wanted to participate in the financing of the programs as well as in other ways. Over the years the contributions of the United States have decreased and the contributions from the American Republics have increased. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, the contributions to the *servicio* funds averaged over \$8.00 from the Latin American governments to \$1.00 from The Institute of Inter-American Affairs representing the United States. If the administrative costs of the Institute for salaries, travel, and other administrative expenses are considered as part of the United States cost, the contributions of the Latin American governments still averaged over \$3.00 to each \$1.00 from the United States. These figures indicate the enthusiastic support the Latin American nations are giving this inter-American program.

At the beginning of the current year, there were twenty-four *servicios*. With funds made available by the Technical Cooperation Administration—Point Four—the Institute has been able to accept the requests from a number of the American Republics which have been pending for several years and has undertaken to cooperate with those governments through nine new *servicios*. In all these new activities the program contributions are at least

on a matching basis and, as a rule, the American Republics are so enthusiastic that they contribute a substantially larger amount than does the United States.

The thirty-three *servicios* at present operating are distributed as follows:

Health and Sanitation

| | |
|-------------|-----------|
| Bolivia | Honduras |
| Brazil | Mexico |
| Chile | Nicaragua |
| Colombia | Panama |
| Costa Rica | Paraguay |
| Ecuador | Peru |
| El Salvador | Uruguay |
| Guatemala | Venezuela |
| Haiti | |

Education

| | |
|--------------------|-----------|
| Bolivia | Nicaragua |
| Brazil | Panama |
| Dominican Republic | Paraguay |
| Ecuador | Peru |
| Honduras | |

Food Supply

| | |
|------------|----------|
| Chile | Paraguay |
| Costa Rica | Peru |
| Haiti | Uruguay |
| Honduras | |

In March, 1951, a major step was taken to coordinate the program of the Institute within each country having more than one *servicio* by designating one of the chiefs of party as chief of IIAA Mission and providing that the several party chiefs form an IIAA program committee for joint planning and coordination of activities in fields where cooperative projects involving more than one *servicio* could yield results not achievable by independent operation. Examples of such fields are nutrition, health education, vocational agricultural education, and geographic area projects where the interrelated contributions of health, education, and agriculture to economic and social improvement can be demonstrated. This step has been a part of the effort under the Point Four program to relate all technical cooperation activities to the common objective of assisting host governments to develop a coordinated program of economic improvement.

The Administrative Problems of a New State—Israel 1948-51

By THE HON. EDWIN SAMUEL, C.M.G.

*Principal, Institute of Public
Administration in Israel*

THE state of Israel is now three years old. It was born from chaos and confronted at once with war. Ever since its establishment it has been struggling to advance against a stream of immigrants that has doubled the population in these three short years.

The chaos at the end of the mandate was unbelievable. Thirty years of patient constructive work under the mandate were destroyed. Armed guerrillas were roaming the cities, from which the army and police were withdrawn, seizing automobiles in the streets, ripping telephone sets out of public offices, carrying away typewriters, robbing payrolls, and holding up banks. The broadcasting studios with their precious collection of sheet music and recorded music were looted by the guards that were supposed to protect them. Building after building was blown up by Arabs or by Jews. Jerusalem was besieged for months, its water supply cut, its roads blocked, its inhabitants first starved and then shelled. Barbed wire and minefields protected outlying districts. Men, women, and children—Jews and Arabs—were ambushed, killed by snipers, blown up, or put in line and shot. Then regular troops from the neighboring Arab countries invaded Israel. Cities were bombed; villages captured by armored columns. The whole Jewish community mobilized itself for defense against hopeless odds and to its own, and everyone else's, surprise came out the victor. Hundreds of thousands of Arab peasants and townsmen were ordered by their leaders to leave, or fled for their lives, leaving their fields and groves and houses and shops unguarded.

It was in such circumstances that the new state was born. The plans for it had been prepared beforehand, by committees of Jewish specialists in various fields. But to translate such plans into reality required a trained civil

service, working steadily in congenial circumstances. These were lacking. Everything had to be improvised by amateurs in a hurry. Defense took absolute priority; the frontiers had to be secured. Foreign food supplies had to be assured. Foreign volunteers and specialists brought in by plane to win the war had to be looked after. Immigrant camps had to be built. The Arab areas were placed under military governors. The Jewish underground guerrilla squads became overnight a regular army and had to develop all the normal ancillary services. A new Israel police force had to be built up around the core of the former Jewish members of the Palestine police from which all British and Arab police—the vast majority—had left. The same kind of situation prevailed in the postal and railway services and in the departments of agriculture and public works. A wholly new diplomatic and consular service had to be created at short notice as one foreign country after another (the United States among the first) recognized the new state.

The new state took over from the former British administration a great many public buildings—telephone exchanges, harbors, railway stations, post offices, law courts, and massive police barracks. It also took over a number of valuable administrative traditions—from the post office, from the police, from the law courts, and from the British army in which tens of thousands of Palestinian Jews had served in World War II. Above all, it took over a body of law that had been developed by British jurists over more than a quarter of a century, based on the best British, Dominion, and Colonial practice and especially adapted to Palestinian needs. A few provisions of this law, such as the hated restrictions on immigration and on land purchase, were immediately

abrogated, but the rest remain as a monument to the interlude of British rule.

The first Provisional Government of Israel was an almost all-party coalition headed by many of the men who had been Jewish political leaders for years as members of the Jewish Agency (representing the World Zionist movement as a whole) and the Jewish National Council (representing only the Jews of Palestine). The division of functions between the existing World Zionist movement and the new government of Israel is still a matter of debate.

The government of Israel is determined to be master in its own house; but with the heavy burden of defense it is not in a financial position to bear the full cost of transporting immigrants to Israel and to maintain and settle them. Immigration and settlement are still mainly the function of the World Zionist movement. The position is complicated by the fact that the government of Israel is responsible to Arab electors in Israel as well as to Jewish electors, while the Zionist movement has only Jewish electors.

The Zionist movement is fifty years old, and the biennial Zionist Congresses have given valuable experience to Jews all over the world, and especially in Palestine, in democratic parliamentary procedure. The electoral system of the Zionist Congress unfortunately is based on the party list system of proportional representation, which favors the existence of numerous small parties. This system has been adopted by the new Israel Parliament or *Knesset* and, as a result, the Governments of Israel are inevitably coalitions, which is a source of great instability. No single political party has an absolute majority in the *Knesset*; and in any coalition the junior partners are always tempted to blackmail the senior partner in return for their continued support.

Another weakness of the government of Israel is its financing. The burden of armaments is severe and will continue to be so as long as the Arab states refuse to sign formal peace treaties with Israel. On this, the protagonists have diametrically opposed views. The Arab states say to Israel: "First take back or pay for the resettlement of the Arab refugees and then we'll make peace." Israel says to the Arab states: "First make peace and then we'll discuss the refugees." Meanwhile, the Arab blockade

imposes an additional financial burden on Israel. Instead of being able to buy cheap Arab food from next door, Israel has to import supplies from afar at much greater cost. Nor can Israel sell her manufactured goods in Arab states but must develop new markets elsewhere—in Turkey and in Southern Europe.

But it is the flood of immigration that imposes the greatest strain on Israel, especially on its finances and on its administrative machine. The rapid increase in population (from 750,000 to 1,500,000 in three years) unaccompanied by an equivalent increase of production has resulted in further inflation. This has forced the government to reimpose the rationing of food, clothing, and building materials that had been lifted at the end of World War II. Licenses and queues are never popular anywhere and involve the civil service in constant bickering with the public. The need to control inflation at all costs, coupled with the desperate need for funds to pay for armaments and to buy food from abroad, has resulted in greatly increased taxation, the enforcement of which is an added strain on the administration.

For the first two years, the financing of the government of Israel was only possible through the constant issue of treasury bills which, of course, directly increased inflationary pressure. At the same time the need for the large-scale importation of capital goods for settling the new immigrants (building materials, agricultural equipment, irrigation pipes, factory machines, and so on), on top of food and armament purchases, has caused a serious shortage of foreign exchange. This in turn has necessitated a restriction on foreign travel and the reintroduction of the World War system of import licenses and priority boards, all of which have added to the problems of the administration.

Israel is a country seething with activity. Innumerable people, both officials and private citizens, are active in promoting and developing the undertakings which employ them or in which they have an interest. They are fighting one another for priority treatment, for a share of the scanty materials and foreign exchange and housing and skilled manpower available. In such circumstances, the task of the Treasury in keeping some sort of control over the economic and, above all, the financial stability

of the country is extremely difficult. It involves much centralization and consequent red tape and delay. Until recently, for example, new government appointees often had to wait months before they received their first salaries owing to the number of different offices through which their salary bills had to pass before they received final approval.

The civil service of Israel is growing month by month, but it is still far from perfect. At the beginning, it was little more than a collection of officials, and only now are they being welded into a civil service with an *esprit de corps* and a tradition of its own.

The Israel civil service has been drawn from at least six different sources. There were, first, many of the former Palestinian Jewish civil servants from the mandatory administration. A few failed to pass the loyalty tests required by the new state, but most were reappointed. Then there were the officials of the Jewish Agency and the Jewish National Council, especially in their immigration, colonization, and education services, who were transferred individually to the new Israel ministries. To these were added many men and women who had served in clandestine Jewish organizations during the mandatory period, especially in secret defense and in organizing clandestine immigration from abroad. When the new Jewish state was declared these people, who had often risked their lives and liberty from purely patriotic motives, could now come into the open. Many received their reward by appointment to the civil service.

The Cabinet Ministers of the first Provisional Government had themselves to build up their own ministries. For their principal assistants they often chose leading members of their own political parties. These were the men they knew best and could trust to carry out their policies. It is taking some time for these men to accept the fact that they are now state officials and hence out of active politics. The liberty still officially given to them to take part in active party politics is not conducive to the establishment of a neutral civil service with high standards. Further limitation is essential.

Another source of civil servants is the free professions: lawyers, doctors, engineers, architects, economists. In many cases, these specialists were seconded by their offices for a specific

period to help set up the new technical services on a dollar-a-year basis. In other cases they transferred permanently to government service, often at a distinct financial loss. Some highly specialized posts which could not be filled from within Israel were filled by experts engaged abroad. A number of such posts have been filled by professional men and women among the new immigrants. When such persons are discovered they are sent at once to the special residential colleges that have been established all over the country. There they receive an intensive training in the Hebrew language without which they cannot exercise their profession. I know of no country where this system of training professional people among new immigrants is as thorough and as extensive as in Israel.

Last, there are the young men and women leaving the Hebrew University and the secondary schools of Israel who enter the Israel civil service as a lifetime career.

In spite of the progress made in unifying all these different types of officials into a single civil service, it has developed a number of major defects. To begin with, it has to provide a constantly expanding service to meet the rapid increase of population. This throws an additional burden on the administration which, in no country, expands as rapidly as the work increases. The Israel civil service is in consequence heavily overloaded, so heavily in fact that it has little time to devote to its own improvement. Then, the Cabinet as well as the heads of the civil service are far too optimistic and ambitious. They do not admit that there is a maximum load and tend to drive themselves and their subordinates to the breaking point. It is as if a half-ton truck were used to carry a three-ton load—and over a bumpy road. Under the mandate, senior civil servants were rewarded for good service with knighthoods; under Israel, they are given stomach ulcers.

Another major defect is government by committee. It is customary in all countries to use committees for legislative deliberation, for thrashing out policy, and for judicial review, but hardly ever for execution. In Israel there is so much fear of official despotism and so little confidence in the political neutrality of the civil service, that, whenever something has to be done, as often as not a committee is put in

charge and not a single executive officer. Owning to the multiplicity of committees and the small size of the civil service, all the leading officials are on several committees, and, when detained in one, keep a second waiting.

A third defect is the overcentralization of the civil service, which is only now being remedied. Some civil servants who came from the professions or from politics were accustomed all their lives to doing everything themselves and find it hard now to delegate. Others would like to delegate but do not know how to do so without losing control. Some are jealous of their own subordinates, especially of those who are ambitious or who have different party allegiances, and fear that delegation of authority would eventually lead to their own redundancy. In other cases subordinates are conscious of lack of experience and are disinclined to assume responsibility.

As a result of this overloading and overcentralization, few senior officials in Israel have time to think. They are expert improvisers and are apt to rely on this capacity instead of on careful planning. Things are not thought out fully in advance and possible difficulties considered. The cost of a scheme, and the staff and the time required to execute it, are therefore often grossly underestimated. As a consequence, there is often much public discontent at the inefficiency of government. But the Israel public is notoriously critical and hard to please; it does not realize the difficulties involved and is apt to blame the government for things quite beyond the government's control.

In some ministries, the structure that has been developed itself leads to congestion at the top. It may happen that although only three, four, or five divisions were originally planned, each subdivided into sections, the heads of some sections, often for reasons of personal prestige, have got their sections elevated to the status of divisions. The director-general of such a ministry now finds that he has eight, nine, or ten heads of divisions to see instead of three, four, or five. This swamps him in a mass of detail at headquarters so that little time is left for inspection at out-stations or for contact with the public.

Inspection is today still one of the weak points in the Israel administration. To some extent, inspection is now provided by the state

comptroller's office, which undertakes not only financial audit but also efficiency audit; but this is not the same as departmental inspection. The state comptroller has been accorded a large measure of independence by being nominated by and made responsible to the *Knesset* and not to the Cabinet and the head of the civil service.

The head of the civil service is the so-called Secretary to the Government. This post is in fact that of Secretary to the Cabinet. But the holder has, in addition, been given (or has acquired) many of the powers formerly exercised by the Chief Secretary under the mandate. The Chief Secretary, on the executive side, was the head of the civil service and deputy to the High Commissioner of Palestine. It was the Chief Secretary who issued directives to the civil service in the name of the High Commissioner, who fixed departmental establishments, and decided gradings, appointments, promotions, and transfers. When the state of Israel was established, some of these powers were vested in the Ministry of Finance and some in the Prime Minister's Office under the direction of the Secretary to the Government. The result was divided responsibility. Now, however, control of the civil service has been unified under the Secretary to the Government, operating through a Civil Service Commission (which, however, is not an independent commission, nor does it in fact have commissioners other than the Secretary to the Government). It is this commission that is responsible for the in-service training of civil servants, and a central training school has been opened for that purpose in Jerusalem. Other schools are planned for Tel Aviv and Haifa.

The Israel civil service is still in the making. When it is fully trained it will be one of the best in the Middle East. It already has developed several valuable qualities. It is, by and large, intelligent, loyal, and hardworking. It is also remarkably free from corruption in an area where corruption is endemic. The *Knesset*, the Cabinet, and the heads of the civil service are all keenly aware of the importance of a good administrative machine. Its development in the past year is most encouraging. In view of the fact that the whole state is less than four years old, to have reached even the present stage is a remarkable achievement.

The Objectives of Governmental Reorganization

By MARSHALL E. DIMOCK

*Visiting Professor of Public Policy and
Administration, Florida State University*

I
T is a fair question to ask whether all the attention that has been given to governmental reorganizations in recent years has been worth the time and effort. Reorganizations seem to come in waves, in cycles; in recent years the press has been full of reorganization talk, sometimes creating the illusion that reorganization is a kind of revivalism in governmental reform, fervid while it lasts, but short-lived. Too frequent surveys by outside experts keep government in a continuous state of turmoil and uncertainty, and so much emphasis may create public expectations which cannot be lived up to. If care is not exercised, this new profession of the organization expert may fall into disrepute.

Herbert Emmerich found that in a short space of time around 1949, when both the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government and the Rowe Commission for Reorganization in Puerto Rico rendered their reports, over half of the forty-eight states also created commissions or special committees to make comprehensive surveys of their administrative apparatus.¹ In part, of course, this newest wave of reorganization reform may be explained by taxpayer worry over the high cost of government, the dislocations stemming from the expanded functions of a government fighting a

war, and a desire to reduce the extent of public interference in our private lives. Since the motives are numerous and mixed, the objectives and methods of reorganization often lead to conflicting and disappointing results.

On balance, however, the course of reorganization movements in recent years is encouraging because out of the welter of conflicting principles and proposals has come a considerable maturing and humanizing of institutional and organizational theory. We may be on the threshold of significant advances in associational living and constructive administrative reforms. In this paper I shall deal with some of these newer tendencies and suggest objectives and methods of governmental reorganization which seem peculiarly appropriate in the light of the broader social science approach which has developed in recent years. What is needed, obviously, is a mature philosophy of institutional functioning in which so-called techniques are judged in the light of the broader social purposes they are supposed to serve and in which government is treated as a special case only when it actually differs from other institutions.

In 1945 I argued that there are certain principles of organization that are important in so far as they constitute hypotheses which may be taken as a point of departure, but that in each case they must be modified and adapted in the light of the actual total situation. Rules of organization are to be judged by the extent to which they contribute to the achievement of social purposes, and administrative convenience is at all times subordinate thereto. There is a constant danger of overemphasizing formal organization because the real life of the institu-

NOTE: This paper was presented at a Conference on "The Reorganization of the Executive Branch," sponsored by the School of Public Administration, University of Puerto Rico, and the Puerto Rico Chapter of the American Society for Public Administration, held in San Juan, April 20-21, 1951.

¹ Herbert Emmerich, *Essays on Federal Reorganization* (University of Alabama Press, 1950), p. 121.

tion may be found to an even greater extent in the informal or human relations aspects of the situation. The indiscriminate application of reorganizational stereotypes is a temptation that must be resisted. Finally, organization analysis is a continuing responsibility, not a periodic one, because the clue to needed reform is found in malfunctionings which require gradual correction by the responsible officials themselves.² Since 1945, these views have been strengthened and reinforced, owing largely to the researches of others, some of whom are not in the field of public administration at all.

Alexander Leighton, for example, has provided a broad setting for governmental reorganization in the section of his book, *The Governing of Men*, where he summarizes principles deduced from his empirical study of a Japanese relocation center. "An administrative body," he says, "is always part of the patterns of leadership and authority in the social organization of the community in which it operates."³ In other words, an administrative organization, governmental or otherwise, is a part of the total cultural setting, and its utility is to be judged by its total social performance. Hence, this very practical advice: first, give special attention to the task of integrating administration with the leadership customs and habits in the social organization of the people being administered; and second, recognize that the development of effective social organization is a responsibility of administrators and that this means teamwork, not mere paper organization.

Dislocations and stresses, continues Leighton, are the keys to organizational change, but before these keys can be successfully used there must be an understanding of the nature of the stress, the reactions of individuals to it, and the effect of it on systems of belief and on social organization. In attempting to make changes, administrators must consider the habitual attitudes and beliefs of the people with whom they are dealing. Such matters cannot be ignored because in human society the cultural slate is never found wiped clean. This sociological and psychological truth shows clearly how amateurish is the attempt to impose or-

ganizational stereotypes on a cultural situation that is not fully understood.

Leighton also has some wise things to say about how organizational change may be effected, if it is to be accepted and if the reforms are to endure. Whenever possible, plans should be tried out on a small scale and then, after indicated modifications have been made, applied to the whole. And again, organizational change is a community-wide matter, not merely a moving of pawns by the players at the top of the government: "Communication from the people to the administration," he observes, "is no less important than the stream in the opposite direction. . . . 'I know just how these people feel,'" he continues, "should be classed among 'famous last words' of administrators." (pp. 358, 365)

What is the acid test of a needed reorganization? Trouble spots, malfunctionings. When these do not exist there is a *prima facie* case in favor of leaving well enough alone. To reorganize needlessly is to disturb established relationships and ways of doing things, which, following Leighton's analysis, can result only in human and cultural dislocations.

And what is the main purpose of reorganization? First, to make programs more effective in terms of accomplishing group goals. Organization and social purpose cannot be dissociated. In the best and truest sense, therefore, every question of organization is a matter of policy or of politics and involves the ends of the state. A basic rule is that organization is not a "good" (goal, value) in and of itself; it is only a means to a social objective. If this ultimate test is understood, then other objectives, more frequently mentioned by professional reorganizers, fall into their proper and subordinate place. Efficiency? It is a means, not a goal. Economy? The same may be said of that. Administrative convenience? The same.

It is a common temptation of reorganizers to overlook this basic rule, at the cost of defeating rather than promoting the social objectives of reorganization. Consequently, wholesale reorganization plans sometimes turn out, on close examination, to be the means whereby conservative groups hope to lop off governmental functions that interfere with their own interests. Here is a natural application of the principle we are adducing: the foremost goal

² *The Executive in Action* (Harper & Bros., 1945), pp. 162-66.

³ Alexander Leighton, *The Governing of Men* (Princeton University Press, 1945) p. 343.

of reorganization is social purpose or social utility. When interest groups differ as to social utility, the aims of reorganization must also be confused. In these circumstances the way is opened to those who would discontinue desirable governmental functions under the guise of increasing the efficiency and economy of administration. Moves for unwarranted prunings in governmental activities must be forestalled by an alert citizenry, legislature, and executive leadership. So far as I know, the charge of trying to eliminate functions for such a reason cannot fairly be leveled at the Rowe reorganization, but it has often been applied to parts of the Hoover recommendations, especially to the part of the report dealing with federal business enterprises and the two supporting task force reports.

An understanding of program objectives, therefore, as set forth in legislation is indispensable to the would-be reorganizer. He should be criticized if he fails to secure this understanding. He is even more censurable if, without authorization, he attempts to discontinue or handicap social programs which the legislature has initiated.

What are the tests of a sound organization? It is one that has a clearly formulated and, of course, a worth-while purpose; one that has enough singleness of purpose so that those who work within the institution are not constantly drawn one way and then another, winding up in frustration. But it is by no means to be assumed that every institution should be able to reduce its goals to a single purpose. A large government obviously cannot, for it has a greater diversity of function than any other institution in modern life. The problem, therefore, is to make the best synthesis possible and especially to resist the temptation to add together programs which, although apparently similar, are basically so different that if they were lumped no one of them would stand much chance of getting from top management the individual attention it deserves.

Certain practical observations result from this line of reasoning. The first is to guard against the attractive device of forcing numerous programs into a few departments because of some preconceived notion that there is an ideal number of units that a top executive can successfully supervise. If social purpose is the

criterion, then this way of going about reorganization cannot be justified. The sounder rule is to permit as many major groupings as there are major programs in the government, no more and no less. Failure to follow this rule results in loss of program effectiveness.

If I knew, for example, that the people of a country put great stock in the government's providing certain essential services such as transportation, water resources, and an industrial bank, which appropriately take the form of the public corporation with its flexibility of organization and finance, I would not think of subordinating these corporations to one of the major departments, as the Rowe Commission is apparently prepared to do in some cases here in Puerto Rico. And why? Simply because the commission starts out with the simple assumption that everything in government must be integrated around a central framework of organization. I believe that a more effective approach would be to consider the underlying social purpose of these corporations and to give them the managerial and financial freedoms best designed to make them successful. Experience in the United States with this question since the Reorganization Act of 1939 shows that the subordination of public corporations to one of the major existing departments is a mistaken policy. Better that they be made bureaus outright than that they be treated as such while living under the legal fiction that they are corporate entities.

When a program is forced into a department where it does not belong, it may be allowed to sicken and die through neglect, or it may find itself in a situation where there is so much diversity that attention cannot be focused anywhere, causing jealousy, frustration, and submarginal efficiency of operation all along the line. Experience amply confirms the logical expectation that there is no magic in simply placing a large number of programs under the same department. Indeed, in some cases it seems to be more of a hindrance to real coordination than if a larger number of separate units had been authorized in the first place. If the naive assumption were true that the smallest number of units is the best condition, and if it were equally true that no department can become too large, if only skillfully administered, then the logical conclusion, *reductio ad*

absurdum, would be that all of government might be administered in a single department.

The same common-sense logic should be observed when the problem of duplicating activities is considered. The neophyte is inclined to think that all statistics belong together, all economic analysis, all engineering, or even all purchasing and so-called housekeeping functions. But there is another rule that enters here and that must be balanced against the simple assumption that everything answering to the same description should be placed in the same pigeonhole. This rule is that all functions essential to the success of a major program should be brought together under the same managerial control. This is sometimes called unity of command and in recent times it has been attacked as sounding too authoritarian or exclusive. But is it? I think not, when viewed in a common-sense fashion, for all we are contending is that major programs are more likely to succeed when all elements required for successful performance are brought together in one place and under one person who, in the last resort, has the final decision concerning that program. It does not mean that there is no one in a superior position to him, for there almost invariably is—a Governor, or a President, or a legislative body. And it does not mean that there are no cooperative relationships with other major programs or with staff agencies of the general government, because obviously both of these kinds of relationships are necessary and both are part of the professional obligation of the top operating official.

As a general rule, coordination is preferable to complete unification. Under unification, departments become too large and too diversified. The life is drained out of the component parts. There is a progressive slowing down of action with every added layer of coordination. There are inadequate encouragements to subordinate officials to act in an enterprising manner.

Thus the reorganizer, if he is on his toes, must be something of a crystal gazer. He must be able to look ahead and see the shape of things to come. In his essays on federal reorganization, for example, Herbert Emmerich comments that "The triple threats of war, depression, and the depletion of our natural resources continue to be major concerns of our public life." (p. 123) If the validity of this

prognosis is assumed, then these are major factors to be considered in devising the grand strategy of reorganization for the federal government. Similarly, if it is assumed that in Puerto Rico the conservation of resources, the balancing of agriculture and industry, the raising of the real wages of the average family, and the training of skilled managers for public and private concerns are major goals, then appropriate program and organizational implications immediately stand forth affecting the departments of education and those concerned with the national economy. In a very real sense, organization is but a reflection of consensus as to group goals reached by those who possess the influence to affect such goals. The ideal, of course, is that the whole of public opinion should take part in this vital democratic process.

II

HAVING now considered the purposes of reorganization and some of the factors that enter into the division of the work load, let us turn to another large area of policy and administrative principle—the role of the chief executive. Here we find two quite distinct schools of thought. One, the older, holds to the constitutional and legal view which vests all executive authority in one man, the man at the top. Consequently, all administrative structure is built around him, and the point of departure is from the top down. The principles enunciated stress undivided authority, complete integration of all units of organization from apex to base, and the provision of large amounts of staff service to enable the chief executive to do his job passably well. This is essentially the point of view of both the Hoover Commission and the Rowe Commission.

The other approach, a newer one which is rapidly growing in favor, emphasizes teamwork and focuses attention on the major departments and programs of the government. As will readily be seen, it is a logical projection of the principle of social utility advocated above. Here the emphasis is placed on the necessity of many men and many programs working together voluntarily and cooperatively. Instead of underscoring the transcendent importance of the top man, it stresses departmental leadership, middle management, and the weld-

ing together of workers in all the departments and agencies constituting the general government. If the first approach may be called "top-down emphasis," this one may be characterized as "bottom-up orientation." It does not bring into question the undoubted legal and constitutional importance of the chief executive; it merely says that his power is a formal distinction, with practical implications affecting such matters as the constitutional independence of the executive branch in its relation to the legislative branch. Essentially, the newer emphasis is a management approach as contrasted with a purely legal one. It concentrates on the question of how a huge, complicated bureaucracy can be made to produce administrative results which are businesslike and effective.

In calling attention to these two seemingly opposed points of view, I do not wish to be interpreted as concluding that they cannot ultimately be reconciled, taking the best from each and forming a composite theory which will possess the advantages of both. Not only do I believe that such a synthesis is possible; I believe it is urgently needed.

The most important objective of both the Brownlow and the Hoover reorganizations of the federal government was to "institutionalize" the Office of the President. Forced to admit that the chief executive has so many other functions of a policy, political, and ceremonial nature that practically he can never find the time to administer the executive branch personally, the way the head of a smaller enterprise would, the reorganizers fell back on the argument that the deficiency could be compensated for if only the chief executive were provided with enough staff services to do the work for him. In consequence, as everyone knows, the President has an immediate organization of staff agencies and officials surrounding him which, added together, would constitute a good-sized operating bureau if it were placed elsewhere in the administrative mechanism. The chart in the Hoover Commission report surrounds the President with his immediate White House office and staff secretary (including the six administrative assistants with "a passion for anonymity"), plus

the Office of the Budget, the Office of Personnel, the Office of the Economic Adviser, the National Security Resources Board, and the National Security Council. Except for the Office of Personnel, these recommendations have for the most part been put into effect, and apparently the end is not yet in sight. Emerich, for example, recommends that the President be given "three principal assistant economic advisers" to aid the staff now concerned with that work. (p. 131) And I have talked with members of the President's staff who believe that there should be six such persons dealing with high policy, to parallel the six administrative assistants provided for in the Brownlow plan.

Where does this process stop? It is granted that some staff assistance is necessary, but is it not possible to carry a good thing to extreme lengths? May it not even be that the fault has been incorrectly diagnosed, with the result that the remedy now being attempted is not so effective as some other that might be invented? I am one of those who believes this to be the case and that there are other practical alternatives which will be resorted to once the present expedient has been recognized as the makeshift it is.

My reasoning proceeds as follows: When an institution is of manageable size and the chief executive is free to devote most of his time to administration—which is true in most cases, of course—then there is no question but that the chief executive should be the efficient head of the enterprise. In extremely large organizations, however—notably in government—this situation is not found. A President or a Governor is usually party leader, prime mover in legislation, commander-in-chief of the military forces or the police, leading spirit in diplomatic relations, and ceremonial head. All of these duties take time and energy, and some are almost full-time jobs, or could be. There is only about a sixth of a person left over, therefore, for the arduous task of directing and controlling the administrative program—a program which exceeds most private businesses in variety, size, and inherent administrative difficulties. Most practical men, when they understand the constitutional burdens imposed on the chief executive in public office, must conclude that it is absurd to expect him actually to

administer a far-flung program in addition to everything else he has to do.

Even in large business organizations, no chief executive would try to compensate for his potential overload by building up a big staff of assistants in his outer office. Although this does not show conclusively what policy government should adopt under similar circumstances, at least it suggests that perhaps executives in large governments are trying to solve their problems the wrong way. What is the practice in large corporations? Usually the top man is relieved of detailed operating duties by their delegation to an executive vice-president or some equivalent official. The top man is responsible for relations with the board of directors, the government, and the public (corresponding to diplomatic relations in government), and he is also the chief policy man (politics and legislation), and a symbol (ceremonial function). These functions are so important that corporations can afford to pay the top executive to work at them full time. So can democracies, if only we have the wit to see it.

The top business executive usually has only one or two personal assistants in his own office, and they tend to his personal affairs, for the most part, not to company matters. The staff functions are found at the next lower level, the departmental level, where they tie into operating administration. In other words, the staff units assist the organization as a whole and not merely the chief executive, as the Brownlow Committee and the Hoover Commission would have it. This corporate pattern is the way it should be. All the arguments, it seems to me, tend toward that conclusion.

Why institutionalize the Presidency in the first place? Is it not because of a desire to bolster an inherent weakness stemming from the fact that the President cannot give his personal attention to administration? Has it not been found that when you try to bolster a weakness by appointing two or more men to do the job of one, the results are almost invariably bad? If the President is too busy, then do what large business corporations do: provide the equivalent of an operating vice-president. Or, if this is not thought feasible, then make the Cabinet, not the "kitchen cabinet," the effective coordinating device at the top of the government.

Failing some such solution, the chief execu-

tive becomes surrounded with so many advisers who take so much of his attention that he never has enough time for his department heads, where the work of government is actually done. The door of the chief executive's office should be open at all times to his department heads in order that he may see them as often as need be to develop teamwork and a real meeting of minds. This is an important rule of human relations and of administration. But can it be made to work successfully under conditions such as have come to prevail in the White House? Increasingly the President is insulated in own office, cut off from the rest of government, and forced to rely primarily on the information and influence of his "kitchen cabinet." Is it any wonder that Cabinet officials are irked?

Anonymity is no substitute for leadership. The center of the government should be the Cabinet, not the crowded quarters of the President's staff offices. There is no reason in the world why the staff agencies in Washington should not be moved out of the President's immediate organization and placed at the Cabinet level, to occupy a position similar to that of staff services in large corporations. I do not minimize the importance of the staff function in large organizations, but I do hold that overwhelming the President with staff attention does not solve the underlying problem—it merely creates an expedient, a prop, and eventually the situation may become so top-heavy that drastic reform will be necessary. I, personally, cannot imagine a President's serving out his term of office in the White House under present organizational conditions, if he had ever had experience in running a large corporate enterprise where line and staff relationships are sensibly distributed.

What would such a man do, if he found himself in the Presidency? First, he would get the equivalent of an operating vice-president, and second, he would use his Cabinet as an effective coordinating device for policy and control. Instead of institutionalizing his own private office, he would institutionalize the Cabinet. The task force of the Hoover Commission reporting on departmental management supported the general view that the center of the executive branch of the government should be the major departments and that it is high

time to improve their effectiveness. But the Hoover Commission itself brushed aside the proposal that the Cabinet be given coordinating responsibilities with the assertion, which they did not try to support, that "the Cabinet as a body is not an effective council of advisers to the President and it does not have a collective responsibility for Administration policies." The commission then came down on the side of an inflated presidential staff, thus adding still further to an unworkable overload at the top. How can you get around the argument that you should not try to institutionalize what cannot be institutionalized? The President just does not have the time to keep an unwieldy staff in order. In effect, therefore, such an expedient simply transfers from the Cabinet power which belongs there and vests it in an anonymous "kitchen cabinet."

III

THE question may well be asked: Would it be feasible to reduce the amount of staff concentration in the Office of the President? The short answer is: It would, because other governments (even dictatorships) have done it. Policy advisers to the White House could be assigned to the joint committees of the Cabinet or to the major departments and still remain available to the President; in fact, he frequently calls on such advisers today. When Henry Morgenthau was Secretary of the Treasury, he provided himself with some topnotch economic advisers serving on a part-time basis; President Roosevelt was constantly calling on these economists. Similarly, the Bureau of the Budget could be located in the Treasury Department and the two agencies dealing with wartime preparedness could be tied into the Defense establishment or even serve as the staff of a joint Cabinet committee charged with coordination in this area. If it is objected that staff agencies at the Cabinet level would have less prestige and less power than at present, the answer is that they might well have even more. At the lower level they would be backed by both the President and his Cabinet, whereas now there is an unfortunate feeling of jealousy and rivalry because of the "inside track" the staff agencies have to the President's attention. They might have to work harder to "sell their wares," but it is only appropriate that a staff

agency should have to sell itself; it is not an agency of command, it is an agency of counsel and advice.

I have seen no convincing reasons advanced to show that the reforms I advocate are unworkable. What are the arguments? "How do we know that the President can trust his Cabinet Secretaries?" is one of them. Well, in government you have to trust somebody, and if you can't trust a Cabinet head, you can always fire him. It is the President's job, like that of any other executive, to build team cooperation and loyalty, and he has the initial advantage that everyone belongs to the same political party. Another argument holds that "the President would not dare to delegate decisions to his Cabinet because under the Constitution he alone is responsible." But this is no real objection. Of course he is responsible. If he disagrees with his Cabinet he can do as President Lincoln did, or as any other strong character would do. But if he gets good people in his Cabinet, consults them, and gives them a feeling of importance and confidence, it would strengthen administration and also make party responsibility mean more than it does at present. Both are sorely needed. Both will have to come in time, I am convinced, if we are to survive as a great nation.

What I suspect is that some of our reorganizers are just plain allergic to the term "politics." They do not favor the Cabinet device because they trust anonymous experts; and they do not trust Cabinet officials who have been, and often remain, in the thick of practical politics. If this is true, I fear for the future of democratic government in the United States and I am almost persuaded that Professor Burnham was right when he predicted that the managerial revolution will one day overwhelm us. According to a recent article in *The Saturday Evening Post*, President Truman is making a considerable success of Cabinet meetings as a coordinating device. Why not go on from there? Why not institutionalize the Cabinet?

To summarize this part of my argument, if social effectiveness is the goal of government programs, then organization should be built around the departments and the Cabinet, not around the office of the Chief Executive. Planning and administration proceed more often

from the bottom up than from the top down. It is the function of the chief executive to foster the programs beneath him. He rules but he also serves. To the extent that he emphasizes service, the government as a whole is likely to produce distinguished administration.

I have long felt that this point of view is the correct one, and it has been confirmed in my own immediate experience. Recently, however, it has received impressive documentation and convincing support as a result of empirical studies by members of the Harvard Business School faculty who published their work in a book entitled, *Executive Action*.⁴ The findings and conclusions of these authors are based on intensive studies of working relationships among executives in twelve companies of various sizes and in different parts of the United States, supplemented by materials drawn from other case studies made by the staff of the Harvard Business School. Since theirs is the newer human relations approach rather than one of formal stereotypes, I am persuaded that their theoretical findings are as applicable to administrative behavior in government as they are to the corporate situations which, the authors point out, resemble those in government.

There are many valuable findings in *Executive Action*. Of several points that stand out above others, the first is the deflating of the "Big Man" myth. Under modern conditions, where institutions are large and cooperation is the essence of management, teamwork has replaced the "One Man Show." Few large corporations today are dominated by a single man dealing singly with his subordinates. (pp. 202, 209) Instead, large enterprises are run by teams. As this method of integrating administration receives increasing emphasis, it tends to become the dominant factor in large-scale management. An essential for its success is that men acquire a company-wide point of view. An advantage is that it frees the time of the senior executives for policy matters. The whole emphasis is on developing the talents of younger executives and making them a part of the team. As the authors of the Harvard

study observe, "The concept of the leader as one who helps the organization to do is in fact vastly broader in scope than the concept of the leader as one who holds the helm alone." (p. 208)

This book also contains some penetrating insights into the process of organization and reorganization. An organization is something that is always in the process of being built. Beware of people who have an old-maidish passion for order and the formalizing of every function; they sap the life out of a vital administration. Rather, organization theory tends in practice to recognize the satisfaction of certain human needs in ways that were never anticipated by formal organization planners. The whole structure of formal organization should be designed in the first place to fill human needs as well as to improve efficiency. Because of the very nature of the work, any effort to impose a neatly logical division of duties can go just so far and no farther before it loses touch with the complex threads of reality. And only when the chief executive has an authoritarian outlook—which is increasingly rare—does he seem to derive satisfaction from setting up operating rules *as ends in themselves*, to be observed no matter how serious the loss of flexibility throughout the organization. This would seem to be a bit of advice which would not be amiss to offer to some of our professional re-organizers. (pp. 196, 141, 144, 145)

Yet another major emphasis of this study that deserves underlining concerns the bottom-up approach which has been championed throughout this essay. Here the authors really break some new ground, although they were anticipated by Chester Barnard, Elton Mayo, Ordway Tead, and others. As an organization develops, the top executive's coordinating function may be seen as one which is delegated *from the bottom to the top*, with the top serving those levels which lie beneath it. (p. 88) Although the authority of the top is real, it is real only when the purposes which give it validity are fully appreciated. The administrator, if he is on to his job, finds himself in a position where he must exert authority and at the same time serve those over whom he exerts it. Otherwise there cannot be a true cooperation, an effective team, which is a condi-

⁴ Edmund P. Learned, David N. Ulrich, and Donald R. Booz, *Executive Action* (Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration, Division of Research, 1951), 218 pp.

tion of administrative success. There must be an open atmosphere. The executive must regard his most important function as that of teaching—that is, developing the juniors on his team. Hence he will push decision-making as far down in the organization as he can. (p. 95) For in a very real sense the administrative leader is trying to integrate the needs of the organization with the requirements of the individual for growth and for personal development. (p. 211) A clear inference is that any institution complaining of a shortage of executive material should examine itself to see if it is failing to bring out the latent talents of those juniors who heretofore have gone unnoticed.

The major application of the findings in this study to the matter at hand has already been emphasized: The way to solve the organizational problems of a large institution, like those of the federal government or the government of Puerto Rico, is to build from the bottom up, emphasizing teamwork at the Cabinet level, rather than to assume—as organization experts have been prone to do—that the problem can be met simply by multiplying the chief executive through adding fresh amounts of staff assistance in his own immediate office.

The field of organization is as vast and as complicated as the whole of human relations;

hence it is not surprising if in these remarks I have hit only some of the high spots of the subject. As stated at the outset, however, what we are searching for is a mature philosophy of organizational methods. Perhaps, therefore, I may be forgiven for not trying to deal with subjects as important but as specialized as finance, planning, personnel, government corporations, leadership methods, and systems of executive control.

I have tried to make clear my own belief that skillful reorganization is about the most difficult task in the whole range of human relations. It takes a statesman of the first order to relate group goals and individual aspirations to the complexities of administrative structure. Reorganization is a phase of institutional life; the institution is part of culture; reorganization should be judged by its effect on the economy and on the good life. The center of attention, therefore, should be the success of programs (social objectives). This involves a consideration of values. The narrowly trained technician is often a bull in a china shop when he attempts such a task. In the last analysis, principles of organization are principles of cultural growth and of national aspiration.

Inventorying Files

By HOMER L. CALKIN

*Assistant Records Management Officer
U.S. Department of State*

THE surveying or inventorying of records of the federal government is nothing new. Under authority established by the National Archives Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1122), deputy examiners of the Archives surveyed the records of agencies in the District of Columbia from 1936 to 1938. This survey was designed to provide information on the volume of records, the depositories in which they were stored, the state of their preservation and arrangement, the hazards to which they were exposed, the impediments to work in the depositories, and the volume that would probably be transferred from time to time to the National Archives. In January, 1936, the Works Progress Administration launched the survey of federal archives in an attempt to locate and identify records of the federal government outside of Washington, D. C.

Since that time a number of agencies, particularly those created and liquidated during or after World War II, have made partial or complete surveys. The results have probably been as variable in value as have been the methods of making the surveys. Some have proved to be of great value; others have not been worth the time and energy expended. Sufficient advance planning and an adequate understanding of what a survey or inventory can contribute to records management are important factors in the success of an inventory.

Inventorying has been of such interest that the Interagency Records Administration Conference devoted its meeting of February 17, 1950, to "Record Inventories, the Why and How." A number of recent developments in the records field may be expected to give further impetus to inventorying activities. First, the Task Force Report on Records Management prepared for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the

Government directed attention to the records problems of the government. Second, the Federal Records Act of September 5, 1950 (Public Law 754, 81st Cong., 2d session), authorizes the administrator of the General Services Administration "to inspect or survey personally or by deputy the records of any Federal agency. . . ." The act further requires the head of each federal agency to "establish and maintain an active, continuing program for the economical and efficient management of the records of the agency." Finally, records are currently being produced at a rate probably little short of that reached during World War II. Their management is an increasingly important and difficult problem.

There is still a lack of guidance for surveying records. Little information in convenient form is available to guide either the uninitiated records officer or even the more experienced person in planning and conducting a full-fledged inventory of files material. What has been printed is usually buried in agency regulations which do not discuss the reasons for taking an inventory, the alternative procedures that can be followed, the manner in which an inventory can most expeditiously be conducted, the results that may be expected, what uses may be made of an inventory, or any other of the pertinent aspects.

This discussion is an attempt to meet this need by analyzing the problems and methods of planning, conducting, and evaluating an inventory of files materials. It is based largely upon recent experience in the Department of State, together with knowledge of surveys in the Office of Price Administration, the War Manpower Commission, and other agencies and study of forms and directives prepared and used by such agencies as the Treasury Department, the Office of War Information, the Office

of the Housing Expediter, the Veterans' Administration, the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and the National Archives.

Although the discussion is directed toward the inventory of federal files, the same principles can be applied in surveying the records of state and local governments, business enterprises, and public and private institutions and organizations.

Background for an Inventory

BEFORE taking or even planning an inventory of files materials, the responsible officials should have an understanding of (1) the relationship between records and the organization; (2) the purpose, policies, and administrative organization of the agency; (3) the meaning of an inventory of files; and (4) the reasons for making a given inventory.

The first essential, then, is a clear understanding of what are records or file materials, what is an inventory, and the relationship of both to the organizational structure in which the program is to be cast.

What are records? They are not, as some people seem to believe, only something that occupies space or may be placed in the same categories, as desks, paper clips, square feet of office space, or other tangible property. Records have been defined and described in various ways. Some have called them the "life-blood" of an organization; others have stated that some agencies fairly float on the records they acquire or produce. In many respects, records acquire a degree of intangibility. It may be stated that they are the principal mediums in which administrative planning and actions are expressed. They are the recorded evidence of knowledge, commitments, and performance, and are therefore the means of assessing the development of, and changes in, activities. As such, records are important both for current administration and for future research.

The second factor that is essential in making a files inventory is a sound understanding of the functions legally placed in the agency as well as those for which responsibility has been assumed because of necessity, for administrative purposes, or for other reasons. It is also desirable to understand the organizational structure responsible for various activities and to have at least a general knowledge of policy-

making and operational activities. Knowledge of these factors, coupled with a full understanding of the role of records, will help in making necessary plans for the files survey and in acquainting top-level personnel with the value of records to the organization and the need for an adequate inventory of them.

What, then, is an inventory? It is more than some notes on scraps of paper, and it is also more than a simple counting of items. In a commercial sense an inventory has been defined as a "detailed list of articles with the number, quantity, and value of each." Translated into terms of records, it is a registration of discernible file units with data on their substantive nature; importance as policy or operational documents; quantity in terms of file drawers, linear feet, or some other unit of measurement; physical nature; arrangement; distinguishing characteristics; and any other information that will clearly identify them.

With knowledge of the relationship of files to the organizational structure and activities of the agency and what an inventory is, the records officer is ready to make plans for conducting a specific survey. A number of basic matters must be considered. These include a decision on what type of information is to be gathered; the preparation of adequate forms; deciding who will make the survey and complete the forms; securing administrative clearances and approvals; training personnel; conducting a pilot survey; and conducting the full-scale inventory. Once the data are gathered, records personnel must tabulate and evaluate them and decide upon what uses can be made of the inventory.

Planning the Inventory

SUFFICIENT time should be spent in planning to assure success. Time well spent in the early stages of the survey will be repaid by more satisfactory results. Unless planning is adequate, questions may arise too late to be considered and desirable procedural changes made.

Information to Be Gathered. Once it has been decided to make a survey of records, the first step is to determine what information should be sought. This is perhaps the most important decision to be made, since the success or failure of the inventory will depend on the

data that are gathered. A survey form on which could be gathered all the information that conceivably might be wanted would be too complicated. Therefore, entries on the questionnaire forms, if such forms are used, should be so selected and phrased as to get the maximum in returns without becoming overly involved.

The records personnel of each organization must select those items that best fit their reasons for taking an inventory and their needs for information in connection with a particular records management program. A number of points that may be considered for inclusion are described below with an indication of why they may be desirable.

1. Unit having custody of records. One of the first things that the records staff will want to know is who has the files at the time of the survey. It is advisable, for the most part, to place the location at the lowest identifiable unit but also to indicate the organizational superstructure.

2. Physical location. The reasons for wanting to know the building and room where files are located is obvious.

3. Person having control. This item indicates the person who can serve as a point of contact at a later time.

4. Number of employees working on files. It is well to know how many persons in an agency or part thereof are working on files; information on the number working full- and part-time will further reflect the situation.

5. Equipment description. If the survey is covering files equipment as well as the records, information on types of cabinets (letter, legal, or other size) should be requested. This question should also yield information on files housed in nonstandard equipment.

6. Equipment inventory number. If the agency uses inventory control numbers on its equipment, a recording of them will aid in the future in locating and controlling the files described on each inventory sheet.

7. Floor space occupied. If there is concern about amount of floor space occupied by files, this question should be included.

8. Security classification. Information on this point should be gathered if the records management group is concerned with (a) equipment to house classified records to meet security regulations, and (b) the problem of

eventually downgrading or declassifying records.

9. Period covered by the file. It is important to know the date covered by each file.

10. Volume. The need for data on the volume of files is obvious. This information will tie in with an indication of the utilization of file equipment.

11. Expected expansion. For planning future developments, estimates of expected expansion over a twelve-month or other stated period may be required.

12. Utilization of file. Some files serve only the unit in which they are located; others serve as a source of reference for several units; others may serve as the central files for the entire agency; and still others may be used by other agencies as well. The inclusion of this question may be desired to relate the importance of one file to others.

13. Identification of contents. All surveys of files will need some question of this nature. This is the heart of the survey which yields information on the substantive nature of the records.

14. Agency of origin. This information should be included as a part of the identification of contents if there are considerable quantities of inherited or transferred files.

15. Title of series. If the records have a definite title, this may be requested so that it can be used as an easy method of future reference. This information can be secured as a part of item 13.

16. Type of file. Information on whether the file is central, divisional, office, work, house-keeping, reference, for private use, or other may be requested. This information also can be obtained as a part of item 13.

17. Files arrangement. This question will indicate whether the files arrangement is alphabetical name, alphabetical subject, chronological, decimal subject, subject numeric, geographical, or other.

18. Files manuals or instructions. To plan for the preparation of files manuals or other guides, a knowledge of those already in existence will point up those areas needing further development.

19. Files outlines. Where filing instructions are lacking, it may be desirable to gather information and copies, if possible, of files out-

lines which will prove useful in organizing new filing systems.

20. Activity or frequency of use. This information is useful in determining the length of time files should be retained in an office and when they may be retired to depositories or become eligible for destruction. The information can be recorded in terms of degree of activity (active, semi-active, or inactive) or by the approximate number of times the files are used per day, week, or month.

21. Work or distribution file. This question will furnish data on whether the file is used in connection with the activities of a specific unit or serves as a place for keeping copies of reports, studies, or other materials to be distributed among a number of units.

22. Use of central files. Information on the frequency of use of central files is of value in assessing the relationship between decentralized groups of records and the central files and the degree of dependency of a given unit on the central files. In other words, are the central files "central" in name only?

23. Indexes. The reason for recording information on indexes should be obvious.

24. Extent of preparation of indexes. Information on the percentage of incoming and outgoing documents indexed will aid in the evaluation of this phase of records practices.

25. Use of indexes. It may also be of value to know if the index cards are used for purposes other than as finding aids; for example, they may be the basis for the preparation of statistical reports.

26. Other finding aids. Sometimes finding aids other than indexes (e.g. registers of correspondence, descriptive lists) are available. Information on this point should be of assistance in making more effective use of the agency's records.

27. Appraisal. In order to obtain the views of the administrative and operating personnel who use the files, it is advisable to ask for opinions of future value of the records for legal, administrative, and research purposes.

28. Routine or valueless records. Information on the presence of materials of little value as contrasted with records having vital operational usefulness will aid further in appraising the records.

29. Requirement by law. If the retention of

certain types of records is made mandatory by law or regulation, this information should be recorded.

30. Language content. If considerable quantities of records are in a language or languages other than English, this information may be useful to the records management staff in making plans to handle this particular type of files.

31. Order. Information on whether files are in good order, slightly disarranged, or completely disarranged will be of assistance in knowing how much processing or rearrangement will be necessary before the files are ready for retirement to a depository.

32. Kind of copy. To assist in determining the disposition to be made of records, it may be desirable to know whether they are original, carbon, printed, processed, photostatic, microfilm, or other.

33. Physical duplication. It may be desirable to know if there is duplication of records in the same office, or elsewhere in the agency or the government, to aid in deciding disposition.

34. Content duplication. Some records not physical duplicates may be duplicates in content. If this information can be supplied by those completing the form, it may be well to request it.

35. Distribution. As another help in planning disposition, it may be advisable to request information on distribution. This should probably be a two-part question: (a) If it is an originating office reporting, how many copies were prepared, where was the original sent, and where were other copies sent? (b) If it is not the office of origin, from what offices were the copies received?

The above points have been cast primarily with paper records in mind. Many agencies have files of maps, motion picture film, memo-vox discs, wire tape recordings, charts, posters and other graphics, and pictures, including negatives. These types of records can also be inventoried. If there are large quantities of any one type, it may be useful to prepare a specialized inventory form to gather information on it.

It should be emphasized again that the questions to be answered on the form should be kept at the lowest possible number or the form will become too complicated. Questions for

ILLUSTRATION A

(Front)

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Form T-622 4-3-51 | | Department of State FILES INVENTORY SHEET (Prepare in Triplicate) | |
| 1. Material in the Custody of | | 5. Equipment Description | |
| Foreign Service Post | | ___ Letter Size ___ Legal Size | |
| Office | | ___ Other _____ (Specify) | |
| Section | | Property Inventory Number _____ | |
| 2. Building and Room No. | | 6. Security Classification | |
| 3. Name of Person Having Control | | ___ Classified ___ Unclassified ___ Both | |
| 4. Number of Full- or Part-time Employees Servicing Files | | 7. Period Covered by File: | |
| | | from _____ to _____ (Month, Year) (Month, Year) | |
| | | 8. Volume | |
| | | Total Number of File Drawers _____ | |
| | | Total Number Needed for Year's Expansion _____ | |
| | | Volume Not in File Drawers _____ (Give in cu. ft., number of volumes, etc.) | |
| 9. Type of File: Does this file serve only the organizational unit listed in Item 1 above | | | |
| ___ Yes ___ No If No, specify units served _____ | | | |
| 10. Identification of Contents | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 11. File Arrangement to Item 10 | | | |
| ___ Alphabetical Name ___ Alphabetical Subject ___ Chronological ___ Decimal Subject | | | |
| ___ Subject Numeric ___ Geographical or Location ___ Other (Specify) _____ | | | |
| Instructions for operating this file are written: ___ Yes ___ No | | | |
| If Yes, attach a copy. If No, attach a copy of Files Outline, if available. | | | |
| 12. Frequency of Use | | | |
| This material is | | It is used approximately _____ times per | |
| ___ Active ___ Semiactive ___ Inactive | | ___ Day ___ Week ___ Month ___ Year | |
| File is used for: _____ | | | |
| ___ Work ___ Distribution | | | |
| 13. Use of Post Central Files | | | |
| Materials similar to these are requested from Central Files: | | Materials are sent to Central Files: | |
| ___ Daily ___ Infrequently ___ Never | | ___ Currently ___ Infrequently ___ Never | |

INVENTORYING FILES

247

(Back)

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Form T-622 4-3-51 | | Page 2 |
| 14. Indexes Are there Indexes to this material: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (If yes, explain in Item 15). | | |
| 15. Description of Indexes | | |
| Size _____ Total No. of Drawers _____ | A. Arrangement (Check One or More) <input type="checkbox"/> Alphabetical Name <input type="checkbox"/> Geographical <input type="checkbox"/> Alphabetical Location <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanical (as IBM, Key-sort) <input type="checkbox"/> Alphabetical Subject <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) <input type="checkbox"/> Chronological | |
| B. Are Index Cards prepared on all materials received: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | | |
| C. Are Index Cards prepared for file copies of outgoing communications: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | | |
| 1. Are these Index Cards: <input type="checkbox"/> Active <input type="checkbox"/> Semiactive <input type="checkbox"/> Inactive | | |
| 2. Are these Index Cards used other than as finding aids: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, specify _____ | | |
| E. How long do you anticipate needing these Indexes: <input type="checkbox"/> 6 Months <input type="checkbox"/> One Year <input type="checkbox"/> _____ (Specify) | | |
| F. How many drawers are required for a year's expansion: | | |
| G. Are there other finding aids available: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, specify types _____ | | |
| 16. Appraisal of File | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Records have important continuing value for current operations. | | Do they include papers of a routine nature? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Records have (Historical) (Research) (Statistical) (Legal) or _____ value. | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Records are required by law or regulation. If so, specify. | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Records have temporary administrative value only. | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Records are nonessential. | | |
| 17. Remarks <hr/> | | |
| <hr/> | | |
| Date | Prepared by | |
| Date | Approved by | Title |

ILLUSTRATION B

INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE OF FILES INVENTORY SHEET

What is to be inventoried

All file materials in the custody of the post are to be inventoried. The inventory shall cover all files (correspondence, despatches, telegrams, reports, forms, mimeographed and printed materials, etc.) that have accumulated in or have been acquired by the post. This includes (1) the central files of the post; (2) all files maintained outside of the central file room for or by members of the post complement; (3) files of programs which are either supervised by or a part of the post's activities, such as the USIE program and the military assistance program; (4) all other agency records transferred to the custody of the post, for example, records of the Office of War Information and the Foreign Economic Administration; and (5) and any other files that may be in the custody of the post. All file materials shall be covered in this inventory, whether in file cabinets, storage areas, boxes, bookcases, shelving, or other equipment.

Who is to prepare the Inventory Sheet

Form T-622 is to be prepared by each individual having files under his control. Control means receiving and arranging material, performing filing operations, and being responsible for the servicing and maintenance of the files.

When the Inventory Sheet is to be completed

Form T-622 is to be completed and approved within 4 days after its receipt.

Approval of the Inventory Form after it has been filled out

The supervisor of the person filling out the form should review and approve it before it is returned to the chief of mission or the office designated by him to be responsible for conducting the inventory.

Entering Information on the Inventory Sheet

Information should be typed on the inventory sheet. The following instructions are given to assist in giving adequate answers to the questions:

Items 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 13, 14, and 15. Self-explanatory.

Item 4. Insert the number of full-time or part-time employees who assist the person-in-charge in maintaining and servicing the files. If there are none, insert the word "None".

Item 5. Check the size of the file cabinet containing the file being described. If the file is contained in other than letter or legal size cabinets, indicate size under "other". Include property inventory number where possible.

Item 7. If the file is closed, enter the earliest month and year and latest month and year. If it is being currently added to, give the beginning month and year only, and insert after "TO" the word "Present".

Item 8. Indicate the total number of file drawers containing the material identified in item 10. Estimate the number of file drawers that will be needed each year for expansion. If the material is not in file drawers, indicate the volume in cubic feet, number of volumes, or some other measurement.

Item 10. The "Identification of Contents" is intended to identify the unit of material being described beyond reasonable doubt and to provide certain facts about it.

Step One: Determine the units of material to be identified on the inventory sheets. Identification is to be made in terms of file units. A file unit is a group of records which falls into a separable unit because (a) it is organized under a single filing system, or (b) it relates to a particular subject or activity. One file unit ends and another begins when the filing arrangement and/or the subject matter of the records changes. The material in each file unit except as noted below, should be identified on a single inventory sheet. This file unit may be comprised of the contents of one file drawer or any number of file drawers or cabinets. *Exception:* A single inventory sheet should not cover the contents of less than one file drawer unless that is all the drawer contains.

Step Two: Describe the contents of each file unit in sufficient detail to provide an accurate understanding of the records and the operations to which they pertain. The unit can be identified by stating: (a) the subject or activity to which the file relates, and (b) the physical types of material. The subject or activity may be shown by (1) the title of the file (for example, Active Visa Applications or Record of Fees); (2) the major subject or activity with sub-groupings or sub-titles listed thereunder; or (3) a descriptive statement of the contents of the file. The physical types may be identified as follows: (1) correspondence files, described as incoming or outgoing, or both; (2) forms, identified by form number and title with additional information on the purpose and use of the form if the title is not self-explanatory; (3) reports, identified by their nature (statistical or narrative), by content (political, economic, cultural, etc.), or by frequency (daily, monthly, annual); and (4) printed and processed documents, described in general terms without giving long lists of titles.

Item 11. Check the filing method used, taking into consideration the following definitions. If these methods do not apply, explain your method in "other".

Alphabetical name file: A file arranged in alphabetical order by name of individual, company, organization, etc.

Alphabetic subject file: Major subjects arranged alphabetically with minor modifying subjects arranged alphabetically in secondary positions behind the major subject.

Chronological files: Files arranged by date.

Decimal subject file: A grouping of specific related minor subjects under a generic major subject, each major subject of which is usually identified by a whole number with the minor subjects being identified by a decimal fraction of the whole number.

Geographic or Location file: Arranged by name of state, town, province, etc.; or by physical or natural feature, as river, bay, mountain, etc.; or by established areas, as administrative or organizational levels, etc.

Subject numeric file: A file arranged by major category with serial numbers thereunder to indicate subdivisions.

Item 15. The terms used in this question are defined as follows: *Active:* Used several times a day; *Semiactive:* Used several times a week; *Inactive:* Used several times a year or not at all; *Work File:* Used in connection with the operations of the office; *Distribution File:* Provides a source from which copies of documents are supplied.

Item 16. Check one or more of the appraisal statements. Cross out the inapplicable words in parentheses.

Item 17. Continue here any answer which needs further space, using the corresponding item number. If this space is insufficient, continue on a sheet of bond paper attached securely to the inventory sheet.

which there are likely to be no answers or that will not yield information of use to the records management personnel should not be included. Do not include questions that the persons completing the forms cannot answer or on which they can make only wild guesses.

The Form. The inventory form should be designed to facilitate filling in information, later transcription and assimilation of information, and otherwise making use of the survey. There should be a balanced arrangement of items. The use of a variety of types to make certain portions of the form stand out is desirable in most cases. Multilithing the form also helps to give it a professional appearance.

Enough space should be provided for typing in adequate answers to each of the questions. The paper chosen for the form should be of good enough quality and weight to stand considerable use.

Archival or other technical language should be avoided in the questions on the form; questions should be worded so that they will be readily understood by the files personnel or whoever is to complete the forms. Questions should be designed to elicit objective answers. They should also be arranged in a natural progression so that there will be continuity in the answers. (See Illustration A for the form used in the Department of State, which attempts to meet these requisites.)

Instructions. Instructions should be phrased in as simple language as possible. If printed in-

structions are to be the only means of explaining what is desired in the answering of each question, they will have to be more detailed than if training sessions are held. Training sessions are recommended. If they are used, the printed instructions that accompany the questionnaire forms need cover only the most difficult points, to which reference may need to be made after the training session is over. (See Illustration B for a sample set of instructions.)

Timing. The ideal time to conduct a survey of files is now. One of the advantages of the survey is to freeze information on records at a given time. If the records management group holds up inventorying until all the units of the agency have a slack period, the inventory will never be completed. Certain divisions may have periods, such as the end of a fiscal year when they cannot carry the extra burden of an inventory, but adjustments should be made only in cases of unusual necessity.

Unit of Measurement. An important factor that must be decided during planning stages is the unit of measurement to be used for identification purposes. Measurement should be considered in terms of (1) the file series or unit, and (2) the physical container.

The term "file series," used by archivists, has not always been defined in clear-cut terms. No matter how it is explained, it never seems to be fully understood by all of the people participating in an inventory. It may be desirable therefore to talk in terms of "file units," which

can be explained to even the uninitiated as a body of records identifiable by either the filing arrangement or the subject matter or both, regardless of the space occupied. One file unit ends and another begins whenever the filing arrangement and/or the subject matter changes.

The alternative is to dismiss any reference to the unit or series and to identify the files in terms of the equipment housing the records. If the file drawer is used as the unit of measurement and the contents of each drawer are described separately, there is a common denominator for all inventory sheets. This system avoids the need for an explanation of the meaning of file units and provides a tangible element for description. On the other hand, it creates many additional inventory sheets where there are bodies of records of a single series extending through a number of cabinets. To illustrate, the 1950 inventory of the State Department records by file units resulted in approximately 4,000 inventory sheets; if drawers had been used there would have been 60,000 sheets.

Who Should Take the Survey. The ideal way to make a survey would be to have the records management staff go from room to room and file cabinet to file cabinet and record pertinent data. If the files are at all extensive, however, this method is impracticable because of the time involved. It is important that the inventory be completed in a matter of days. Also, under this procedure certain information would still have to be obtained from personnel having custody of, and using, the files.

The more satisfactory method is therefore to have the files personnel complete the forms. They maintain the files, and file and find materials all the time. As a result, they, for the most part, can most easily furnish the data desired.

Securing Top-level Approval and Backing. In laying the groundwork for the survey and informing agency personnel of the reasons for it, two methods can be used. The first is by announcement in an administrative order or other official issuance that a survey of files is to be made. The second is by personal contacts on the part of the records management officer with responsible administrative or executive

personnel. A combination of the two methods is probably desirable.

Through the printed issuance, tangible evidence that the survey has top backing can be placed in everyone's hands. It helps to insure that all questions are answered to the best of the employees' abilities and that all files are reported.

Through personal contact, the records officer can describe in greater detail the records program, the reasons for making an inventory, and the results expected from it. The aid of the executive and administrative officials can also be enlisted in such matters as scheduling the inventory, planning for training sessions, seeing that forms are completed, and acting as a clearing point for the return of completed forms.

The Survey

Pilot Study. A test run in one unit of the agency is important to the success of the survey. It gives the records personnel an opportunity to test the forms for adequacy; to develop training materials, including a sample of a completed survey questionnaire, to be used in later training sessions; to determine the time required to complete the forms and make returns; to check the adequacy of instructions; and otherwise to iron out any "bugs" that may have crept into plans. As representative a division as possible should be selected for the pilot study, not one that has unusually complicated files.

Training Sessions. Training sessions are important even though written instructions on how the survey is to be made and what information is to be furnished are as adequate as possible. This is true whether a limited group or all files personnel throughout the agency complete the forms.

Training sessions have four principal advantages: (1) they emphasize the importance of files personnel and help their morale; (2) they provide an opportunity to show the relationship of the records maintained within any given office to the agency as a whole; (3) detailed information on how the questionnaire is to be completed can be given; and (4) many questions raised by the survey project can be answered in advance of the actual filling in of the forms.

On the basis of experience in conducting more than sixty such training sessions, certain basic recommendations can be made. Sessions forty-five minutes to an hour in length are sufficient in most cases. A session should be divided into three parts: a brief introduction of the session by a top-level official; a lecture by the training officer of from twenty to thirty minutes; and a question period. If a session is opened by someone of the administrative or supervisory staff, those attending know that the program has the backing of policy, operating, and administrative officials. If the person is known to the group being instructed, he can bridge the gap between the group and the training officer if that officer is not known to the group.

The lecture should begin with a general statement of how and why the survey is being made, emphasizing the assistance persons most familiar with the files can give in completing the questionnaires. This introduction should be followed by a detailed explanation of the meaning of each question on the form and the type of information it calls for.

In answering questions the training officer should give answers that are geared as specifically as possible to the files being reported on by the particular group. Suggestions from the audience that will aid in making the survey a success should be encouraged. The instructor should be provided with samples of completed forms to show to his audience. In distributing the survey forms at the end of the session each individual should come to the instructor to receive his quota. Often the timid person who could not bring himself to ask a question before the entire group has a very definite problem that can be settled after the session is over. The telephone numbers of the records management staff should be given to the group so they can call for advice any time it is needed. Members of the staff should also be available to go out to offices to give aid in the survey if a problem arises that cannot be answered satisfactorily by telephone.

The group attending a particular training session should be drawn from the same general area of the agency. The training officer can then select illustrations slanted to this group. Questions and answers will also be generally applicable. A training group should not be too

large, for it is important that the instructor and the attending personnel have a meeting of minds and that the session be kept informal. A group of fifteen to twenty-five persons is a good size.

Completing the Forms. The information on the forms should be typed so it will be legible and there will be no question as to the data recorded. Survey forms should be signed by the person who completes them and approved by a supervisor or some other responsible person in the unit. Completed questionnaires should not filter into the records management staff one by one; they should all be cleared through the administrative or executive office and forwarded to the records officer. Normally the forms can be completed and filed within a period of four working days. Experience with a ten-day period versus a four-day period has shown that four days are enough. The longer the period the more likely are personnel to be late in filling in and returning the forms.

Arrangement, Coding, and Tabulating. When the returns begin to flow into the records management staff, methods of arranging, coding, and tabulating become necessary. Since the sheets will probably be most often studied and used in connection with the functions of a given organizational unit, it is suggested that they be arranged hierarchically in descending order.

If the agency being surveyed is one that uses a symbol for each division (for example, PD stands for the Passport Division in the Department of State), the proper symbol should be prefixed to the serial numbering to provide ready identification for each sheet. Otherwise, symbols must be devised, for they are important to effective control.

Certain statistical tabulations are useful. In addition to total current volume and the anticipated expansion of records for the ensuing year, totals can be computed on the volume of semi-active records, the volume of inactive records, the number of employees working on files, the quantity of files that are indexed, and the quantity for which there are filing instructions. The proportion of records bearing security classifications and the proportion of filing cabinets being used to house other than record materials may be computed. Sub-totals at each organizational level make possible easy

comparison of offices, divisions, or other organizational components. Where the volume of files is great, the possibility of using punch cards for tabulating should be explored.

The Value of the Inventory

AN INVENTORY of files serves a number of purposes. First, it is important both for reference and for research purposes. A good inventory shows in orderly arrangement the organization and subject-matter content of all records of the agency and thus lays the foundation for an agency-wide reference service. It shows the indexes and other finding devices in existence to aid in records use and points up needs in this area. Intelligence agencies, planning staffs, historical groups, and operating units are increasingly aware of the need to locate records quickly in order to carry out many current activities effectively. Records may pertain to the manner in which certain policy decisions were reached; how points of controversy between agencies were resolved; what information has been gathered on a given subject; and an infinite number of other important matters. All who have used records have found that the most obvious sources do not always contain the information needed. An inventory will indicate where all types of information may be located.

Second, an inventory provides the basis for an intelligent records disposition program. The inventory indicates the files that contain useless materials that should be removed immediately; the records that need to be retained in operating areas for operational, legal, or research purposes; and the records that must be held either temporarily or preserved indefinitely but are not needed for current operating use and should be transferred to a depository.

An inventory also furnishes the information needed for better use of present space and equipment and planning for future needs. It

may show, for example, that excellent file cabinets are being used to store office supplies or that a three-combination safe contains records that bear no higher security classification than "confidential." It indicates where particular records should be located for most effective use. It also indicates expected expansion over a stated time period as an aid to planning for space and equipment needs.

In any agency, the inventory can be the prelude to more intensive surveys in certain records areas. The sheets containing information about specific types of records, e.g. budget and fiscal records, can be pulled together and studied before working out comprehensive disposal schedules or other phases of the records program.

The files inventory can serve others besides the records personnel. For instance, it may show up duplicating, or nearly duplicating, files. Such information is useful to the organization and methods staff, for duplication of files usually means a duplication or overlapping of functions.

When a files survey includes training sessions and personal contact throughout the agency, it serves as an excellent public relations medium for the records management program. It will develop a "files consciousness" that could hardly be expected from a campaign through posters, handouts, and the like, no matter how intensive.

A word of caution is in order. An inventory should not be considered a cure-all to all problems of the records management staff. It is only one of the important factors contributing to the continuing job of records management. It must be used in conjunction with flow charts, analyses of files operating procedures, and the many other techniques that are available to records personnel. It is, however, a phase of the records program that is essential to the whole operation.

Aspects of Local Government in England and Wales

By EMMELINE W. COHEN

*Research and Information Officer
Institute of Public Administration*

THE postwar reconstruction program of the United Kingdom has often been described, sometimes with sympathy, sometimes with antipathy, but attention is rarely paid to the part that local authorities are playing in carrying it out. The omission is understandable, for the story is apt to confuse those who do not appreciate the British way of implementing radical changes within an essentially conservative framework. There is no logic in it, but a glance at history gives a clue to the reasons for the peculiarities in what is taking place. This article, based upon observation of selected areas in England and Wales and interviews with their officials, describes trends in some principal local governmental services and presents comments on the status of local government generally.

A Rigid Structure

THE present structure of local government is a makeshift full of inconveniences, like a Victorian house the inside of which has been partially modernized to serve contemporary purposes. It was designed at the end of the nineteenth century. Authorities fall into different categories which originally corresponded to differences in importance and population. There are 83 all-purpose authorities, called county boroughs, autonomous units with mayors and corporations; there are 309 most-purpose urban authorities called boroughs (which have lost some powers since 1944); 572 urban districts and 475 rural districts with minor powers; and (excluding London which by an accident of history falls into this category) 62 administrative counties exercising considerable powers and providing some serv-

ices for all authorities other than the county boroughs within their boundaries.

The original logic of this arrangement is now a matter of history, for while boundaries have remained static, population has changed in size and distribution. Of the county boroughs, eight now have populations under 60,000, which administrators consider to be the minimum necessary for proper administration of any major service. At the other extreme there are 27 boroughs and 4 urban districts which have populations ranging between 60,000 and 350,000. There are 177 boroughs with populations below 30,000 which have the powers and elaborate local government setup of large towns. A description of one of these decayed towns may illustrate what this anachronism means in everyday experience and why the changes instituted in 1944 were necessary.

Take, for example, one of the towns in the industrial north. A small village 150 years ago, it grew in the Industrial Revolution—a period of expansion in wealth and decline in aesthetic values—into a conglomeration of grey solid buildings, the commercial ones large and ugly, the homes planted over thickly to the acre. There are neither parks nor squares, as in the older or newer towns, and the whole place badly needs remodeling. The administrative hub is the massive ornate civic building that was proudly erected in the tasteless days of the town's prosperity. Inside is a large council chamber, with heavy plush draperies, soft chairs for the councilors, and dais for the mayor. Beside the council chamber is the mayor's retiring room, with gilt mirrors and on the walls portraits in oils of past mayors in scarlet robes. Beyond are a now dingy banquet-

ing hall, capable of seating 200 guests, and a fine kitchen. Below are assembly rooms, now let out for dances and meetings. All this pomp and circumstance serves a population of about 30,000. This authority before 1944 was responsible for running and staffing its elementary schools, providing mother and baby clinics and other welfare services, and the lesser sanitary services. Being poor it had to watch every penny. It could not afford well qualified staff. Its education officer, for example, was a promoted clerk who had left school in his early teens and had had no further education. Inevitably services were below standard, but the authority was proud of its independence and fought like a tiger at bay against any loss of its powers.

Obstacles to Reform and Their Results

THERE has been a steady expansion over the years in the responsibilities of local authorities and the standards of service required continue to rise. Many people for decades have understood the need for an overhaul of the local governmental structure. A royal commission appointed in 1923 made exhaustive inquiries which led to nothing because no basis of change could be agreed upon.¹ In 1945 a Local Government Boundary Commission was appointed. This commission also analyzed the situation, consulted with local authorities, and issued some interesting reports that contained suggestions for a basis of reform, but in 1949, before its work was done, it was disbanded, and nothing has come of its work.²

The obstacles to reform are political. Any authority that wishes to extend its boundaries must do so at the expense of another, so every proposal means a fierce fight. Each kind of authority is organized into a strong association which serves as a powerful pressure group, always ready to oppose any change which reduces the powers of its members.

As a result, postwar Governments were faced with so drafting reconstruction measures

¹ Royal Commission on Local Government, 1st Report, *The Constitution and Extension of County Boundaries*, Cmd. 2506. (H.M.S.O., 1925); 2nd Report, *Local Authorities, Their Constitution, Relations, Areas and Functions*, Cmd. 3213 (H.M.S.O., 1929).

² See particularly *Report of the Local Government Boundary Commission for the Year 1947* (H.M.S.O., 1948).

that they could be administered without any alteration in existing local government boundaries. This required considerable ingenuity. Two courses were adopted. The first was to take certain powers away from local government and place them in national agencies. Thus gas and electricity supply, local transport, public assistance, and hospital services were lost. The second was to concentrate responsibility in the hands of the county boroughs and administrative counties, whose populations are normally large enough to be effective administrative units in terms of modern standards. To county governments the new arrangements offered a challenge, and the way in which they have adapted their machinery to meet the functional and democratic needs makes an interesting story.

County Government

COUNTY councils are popularly elected. They work through a number of functional committees and subcommittees, each dealing with a different service or part of a service, such as finance and general purposes, health, education, or supply. Membership on the committees follows the pattern of the party compositions of the council as a whole. Unlike the British civil service, the chief officers in local government are professional specialists; the clerk is normally a lawyer and the county treasurer, the director of education, the county medical officer, the county architect, and so on have had specialized preparation in their respective types of work. The center of government is the county town, which may or may not be the natural geographical or sociological center, depending on the accidents of history.

Since the end of the war administrative counties have taken over from lesser authorities responsibilities for local health and education services, town and country planning, fire services, provision of residential accommodation for infirm old people, care of children deprived of their natural homes, and youth employment services. This is a big assignment from an executive point of view.

Administrative Counties and Educational Reform

THE local administration of education before 1944 was based on provisions of the

Education Act, 1902. There were 315 local education authorities, of which 146 were authorities for both elementary and secondary education and 169 for elementary education only. Boroughs and urban districts whose populations at the time of the 1901 census had satisfied certain criteria were elementary education authorities, and despite changes in the size and distribution of population that took place in the intervening period, there had been no revision of powers. Most children spent the whole of their school life, that is from the age of 5 to 14, in elementary schools, and a minority only passed at the age of about 11 to secondary schools. The effect of the system was that within a single administrative county there could be a number of independent elementary education authorities, each with its own policies and standards. Opportunities open to children were unequal. The 169 elementary education authorities included some whose population was small and financial resources slender, others the excellence of whose schools and policies had a national reputation.

The Education Act, 1944, raised the school leaving age to 15; it also provided that all children should receive secondary education after the age of 11, and that as soon as possible this should be in schools separate from the primary schools. Education is now regarded as a continuous process experienced in different stages, all of which should be interlocked in a coherent policy.

Educational administrators were agreed that for their purposes the right unit of population for school organization lay between 60,000 and 120,000, with a considerably larger unit desirable for planning, policy, provision of specialist advisers, and provision of advanced education such as teacher training and higher technical colleges. Unfortunately, local government boundaries were unrelated to these criteria and as there was no prospect of changing them the government adopted a mixture of boldness and compromise. County boroughs and administrative counties were made the local education authorities; and the former authorities for elementary education only, lost their powers.

This change solved a number of problems but created others. Although it provided big enough units for policy making, it ran counter

to the tradition of associating elected representatives from the neighborhood with the day-to-day administration of the service. It also entailed abolishing a small but significant number of progressive elementary education authorities that were situated within administrative counties whose councils in the past had cared little for education—whose village schools, built in dreary Gothic, lacked proper sanitation, were badly equipped, and had a high proportion of unqualified teachers. Although the act safeguarded standards, there was every reason why progressive towns with a fine school service should fear being put under these authorities with the prospect of being leveled down and stopped from further experimentation and advance.

These objections were met by requiring counties to break themselves down into divisions, each with a population of not less than 60,000. For each there is a committee, known as a "divisional executive," which is composed of representatives from the lesser local authorities within the division, of county councilors, and of nonelected persons added for the special contribution they can make to the work. Counties have delegated day-to-day administration to these executives under agreements that had to be drawn up in consultation with the subsidiary local authorities and were subject to the approval of the Minister of Education. Their scope was suggested in Ministry of Education Circular No. 5, 1944. In addition each school has its own small management committee that meets once a term.

The system is elaborate, but it is working. Its success or failure depends to a large extent upon the professional staff. Each administrative county has a director of education in charge of the education department. For each division there is a divisional education officer, working under the county director. Most divisional education officers have two out of three of the following qualifications: (1) a university degree, (2) teaching experience, (3) administrative experience. Circular No. 5 pointed out that it was upon the tact and good sense, no less than upon the ability and efficiency of these officers, that the success of the new system will depend to an appreciable degree.

Divisional executives are now at work up and down the country. Through them an at-

tempt is being made to meet the inherent weaknesses of large-scale organization—over-standardization and neglect of individual and local needs. Thanks to the foresight of one or two people, since the beginning of the new arrangement there has been a National Association of Divisional Executives for Education. Through its tireless honorary secretary, Dr. L. F. White, information is exchanged and an annual conference is organized at which experience is pooled and policy formulated. In several counties directors of education have encouraged the formation of county associations of divisional executives which hold regular meetings and iron out the differences between the county and the localities.

The reason why so difficult a system is working so well so soon is because educational administration attracts a large number of able, well qualified, energetic men, with a keen sense of purpose and anxious to do a good job for education by democratic means. Theirs is no sinecure. Each divisional education officer has a small simple office which is the hub of the division. To it come members of the divisional executive to ask how a repair to a school in which they are interested is going, parents in need of advice, teachers with personal problems. They hold the balance between the county and locality. One prevents a minor county bureaucrat from asking teachers to fill in unnecessary forms, another discourages an over-zealous member of the divisional executive from pinpricking the county architect about a building delay.

In the county education office, there is usually a large-scale map, studded with colored pins, showing the new schools going up and those planned. In one is a model of the new campus schools, pioneers of their kind in this country; in another is a long list of village schools provided since 1944 with modern equipment and proper sanitation; another office can relate how county specialist advisers in art, music, physical training, or home economics are livening up the curriculum in former backward districts. The number of unqualified teachers employed has fallen rapidly.

The biggest obstacle to educational advancement is shortage of building materials. It has meant that some of the progressive towns have had no new schools since 1939, and are having

to mark time while the rest of the county catches up, but this is the fault of the world situation and not of the education authorities. The vitality of local government is manifest in the sphere of local educational administration.

Local Health Services

ALTHOUGH the National Health Service Act, 1946, took from the county boroughs and administrative counties responsibility for hospitals and curative services, it charged them with many new health duties. These include provision and administration of health centers (at present in abeyance), mother and baby clinics, domiciliary care of the sick through a home nursing service, domiciliary maternity and midwifery services, domestic help for those who need it because they are ill or infirm, health education, vaccination and immunization, and round-the-clock ambulance service. Part of this miscellaneous collection of functions is ancillary to the work of the hospitals and medical practitioners, part is straightforward medico-social work, and the rest constructive social medicine. Each is of itself a prodigious job of administration, each has had a different history, and the stage of development of each varies from county to county.

The National Health Service Act was not concerned with sanitary duties, which are still the responsibility of the lesser authorities. Hence care of the environment is divorced from that of the people in it, supervision of unhealthy dwellings from that of their occupants. This difficulty is only overcome by mutual consent. In some counties the problem is attacked through joint appointments of medical officers who work partly for the county and partly for the lesser authorities, thus securing some coherence in arrangements. The problems in each area are different, and so are the solutions that are being worked out.

A fascinating approach has been followed in an area of the northeast, a bleak gaunt countryside with grim industrial towns that used to be black spots in their health records. The county medical officer is a pioneer in social medicine who has been described as a man with his head in the clouds and his feet on the ground. He and his team have made an opportunity of the act's requirements. This

county is split up into divisional units with populations of about 50,000—units large enough for effective administration, but small enough for the medical officer of the area to have his fingers on the causes of ill health in homes, schools, and factories. They are in charge of school health and of the sanitary authorities, so that there is complete integration of local responsibility.

To attend a conference in one of these divisions is a stimulating experience. The divisional medical officer sits at his table with the relevant statistics of mortality, sickness, call on the local services, and attendance at local mother and baby centers. With him is the sanitary inspector, who knows the streets and the condition of the buildings in the area, the health visitor who knows the families, the chief home nurse, and the tuberculosis visitor. They discuss problems that have cropped up—an unexpected infant death and any deficiencies in the services it might reveal, an infirm old person for whom there has been trouble in finding accommodation, an outbreak of sickness in the schools. Current problems are pinpointed, one of them selected for concerted attack, and a strategy worked out to which each member of the team can contribute. County specialist advice and equipment are on call if need be, and in the background is the inspiration of a remarkable county medical chief.

One or two counties have been keen to encourage neighborhood participation in health administration, and have set up committees, similar to those set up for education, and have delegated responsibility to them in association with divisional medical officers. Where the boundaries of these subdivisions are identical for health and education, a new kind of area unity is growing up and new forms of cooperation are being developed. In some places where there is this kind of delegation some of the difficulties of liaison with other sections of the health service are overcome in informal ways that would not be possible in a highly centralized and therefore formalized organization. In one town, for instance, it was possible to secure cooperation between the hospital and the local health services because of the happy accident that the head almoner at the hospital was the sister of the chief health visitor. These two sensible women got a system working while

high-ranking officers were still trying to overcome insurmountable obstacles.

Some counties, by contrast, believe that their health services are best administered through a highly centralized control, with outstationed officers who operate as agents for the headquarters staff, on the pattern of a well-disciplined and efficient army.

Whatever the method, the aim of an effective service of social medicine is an important one. In the long run the cost of the curative services to the country can best be reduced by the success of the preventive ones, and these are the responsibility of the local authorities.

Town and Country Planning

ENGLAND is one of the most densely populated countries in Europe. It was recently estimated that there are 750 people to the square mile. This makes it especially important that the best use shall be made of the land. From 1940 to 1942, three famous reports on the subject were issued,³ and the Town and Country Planning Act, 1947, gave effect to some of their recommendations. As a result county boroughs and administrative counties became local planning authorities.

Planning involves regulating the use of land and deciding its allocation for different purposes. Although the central government works out the main principles of national policy, local authorities have not only to work out the local implications, but also so to integrate the various elements as to provide as good a living environment as possible. It is a compendious job, and involves both important policy decisions that will affect conditions in the county for a long time to come, such as deciding what land may be exploited for industrial purposes and what reserved for agriculture, and matters of intimate detail, such as whether a particular citizen may erect a particular house on a given site. Various methods of administration have been adopted. All planning authorities have a planning committee. Some of them decentralize day-to-day adminis-

³ *Report of the Royal Commission on the Distribution of Industrial Population*, Cmd. 6153 (H.M.S.O., 1940); *Final Report of the Expert Committee on Compensation and Betterment*, Cmd. 6986 (H.M.S.O., 1942); and *Report of the Committee on Land Utilisation in Rural Areas*, Cmd. 6378 (H.M.S.O., 1942).

tration to *ad hoc* area committees, a number delegate to lesser authorities, and some have developed highly centralized methods.

Whatever the method used, a great deal necessarily depends on the quality and personality of the chief planning officer of the county. His responsibilities are so diverse, covering economics, engineering, sociology, architecture, and other disciplines, that either a superman or a good leader of a team of specialists is needed. Attention has been given recently to the kind of people who should be recruited for the job⁴ and where they should be drawn from.

At the present time 81 of the 153 local planning authorities in the United Kingdom have placed the chief responsibility on engineers, 34 on architects, 32 on surveyors, and 6 on members of the Town Planning Institute who, though without a basic professional qualification, have taken the necessary examinations that the institute requires. It is still too early to see the effects of the differences in emphasis given by officers drawn from these different spheres.

The variations in size and wealth of the various authorities affect the kinds of appointments made. Some authorities are so small that the duties of chief planning officer have to be combined with other duties—usually those of engineer or architect. Large authorities, on the other hand, employ staffs with various technical qualifications, working under the chief planning officer. This does not mean that planning problems of small authorities are less difficult than those of the larger ones, but that they are not able to afford specialization of function.

It is still too soon to see the physical results of the planning measures or to find an emergent pattern in administration. The field is one of the utmost importance, and a recent progress report shows that, despite the difficulties, a great deal of activity is afoot.⁵

General Problems

THIS account of some of the work that county councils are doing is enough to show that local government is still very much alive in the

⁴ Report of the Committee on Qualifications of Planners, Cmd. 8059 (H.M.S.O., 1951).

⁵ Town and Country Planning 1943-1951, Cmd. 8204 (H.M.S.O., 1951).

United Kingdom. It is experimenting to find the best ways to execute its extended responsibilities and to secure citizen participation in administration, for the primary purpose of local government is to act as an instrument of democracy. The link with the people is solid, but in some respects thin, as the last available voting returns show.

PERCENTAGE OF REGISTERED VOTERS WHO VOTED IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS, 1948

| | England & Wales | Eng- land | Wales & Monmouth- shire |
|---|--------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|
| County boroughs..... | 52.3 | 52.3 | 52.1 |
| Admin. counties..... | 42.3 | 42.1 | 53.6 |
| Municipal boroughs and urban districts.. | 47 | 46.5 | 56.8 |
| Rural districts..... | 51.6 | 49.6 | 65.1 |

The reasons for this low vote are complex and have not been fully investigated, but it is a problem of which all who cherish democratic methods in all parties are very much aware.

Local authorities are essentially executive bodies, working within the broad national policies laid down by Parliament. They carry out what is either required or allowed by statute, and to an increasing extent they are spending money which is raised by national, not local, taxation. This means that the central government must exercise some control over them, and the way in which this is done has been a subject of recent discussions.⁶ Local governments have asked for greater delegations of authority and less supervision over details of execution, and many national departments have gone a long way to meet their requests. On the other hand, major authorities delegate certain executive duties to lesser authorities, and these lesser authorities in turn complain of too much detailed supervision. These questions of relationship are receiving a good deal of attention at present.

Perhaps one of the toughest problems is that of the internal organization of local authorities. Each tackles this problem as best it can. The machinery of government was originally designed for simpler purposes, and in some places it is now under considerable strain. Organization is highly departmentalized, a fea-

⁶ First Report of the Local Government Manpower Committee, Cmd. 7870 (H.M.S.O., 1950).

ture emphasized by the way in which authorities work through functional committees. Many projects have to pass through many committees, and are the concern of several departments; building, staffing, finance, and supplies are examples. There is naturally a certain push and pull for power and prestige among committees. Since the chief officers are professional specialists, the job of coordination falls to the clerk of the council. His is a difficult task, which in the larger authorities attracts men of considerable personality and wisdom—qualities that stand them in good stead. Vertical organization and relationships are normally excellent, and even where a large number of officers are outstationed, there is a high sense of teamwork and of integration. Horizontal relationships are usually more difficult, and each authority has its own way of trying to smooth their working.

Staffing methods in local government contrast sharply with those of the British civil service, which recruits from all educational levels. Chief officers in the local government service have professional or technical qualifications; nontechnical officers, on the other hand, are recruited at the age of sixteen or seventeen, direct from school, and work their way up. With only one or two exceptions, of which the most notable is the City of Manchester, local authorities find no place in their service for people of higher or university education. In 1935 local authority associations maintained that it was impractical to encourage the entry of graduates,⁷ and recent evidence shows that this is still the view of most authorities.⁸ It is often a shock to experience the chasm in outlook that separates a professional officer from his chief clerk who, though

knowledgeable about office procedures, often lacks any profound appreciation of the functions which his department administers. His experience is usually parochial, for there has been in the past little movement of nonprofessional staff between authorities.

Personnel questions have received a good deal of attention in recent years, largely owing to the activities of the National Joint Council of Local Authorities. There is now a common system of grading, and promotion examinations have been introduced. These provide a certain consistency in standards throughout the service, but since preparation for the examinations does not involve attendance at classes their educational value is limited.

Recruitment difficulties today are considerable. One reason is that in conditions of full employment there is a much wider range of occupational choice open to those leaving school; another is that educational opportunities are so much improved that young people now receive education commensurate with their abilities and are not forced prematurely onto the labor market. The full implications of these facts for the local government service have not yet been squarely faced.

Conclusion

THERE are contradictions in the contemporary local government scene with its rigid structure and flexible practices. A chart of local authorities and their duties might give the impression of an ancient machine, long overdue for overhaul, creaking under an excessive load. This would be misleading, for in the United Kingdom administrators are more significant than administrative systems. The problems with which they have to cope are challenging, and the outcome is the triumph of men of purpose and good will over an awkward machinery, in the interests of great services that are being rendered to local communities.

⁷ Report of the Departmental Committee on Qualifications, Recruitment, Training and Promotion of Local Government Officers (H.M.S.O., 1935), p. 17.

⁸ Report of the Committee on Qualifications of Planners, Cmd. 8059 (H.M.S.O., 1951).

Equalizing Library Services in New York State

By PHILLIPS BRADLEY

*Professor of Political Science
Syracuse University*

THE progressive differential in local capacity to maintain equivalent services is one of the most acute problems in both policy and administration in the relations of the federal government with the states and of the states with local units. The technological base for insuring the gradual elimination of urban-rural inequalities in most public services, as well as in those activities that we leave to individual initiative, is already laid. It is increasingly recognized, however, that public action to improve economic and social life nationally and within our states requires the development of formulas to equalize the distribution of costs of publicly supported services.

We have the means for equalization in practically any direction we desire and determine. It is most rapidly achieved in fields in which widespread public concern with the provision of the service overrides the apparently universal political "instinct" for local self-government. Highways, public education, and relief are examples of the acceptance of the principle of equalization. Even in the fields in which the principle is well established policy, however, the desire for local control of administration is a strong factor in determining the direction and momentum of both policy and administration.

Public libraries are still a "fringe" concern of most local governments—fringe in the sense that they are not widely recognized and actively supported as a key public service. Few even of our large metropolitan library systems and still fewer systems in small communities receive the degree of popular support which exists for more urgently felt (or demanded) services such as highways, education, or relief. Financial backing, therefore, lags behind both the potential value of the library to the community as a major adult-education service and

the technological knowledge we now possess of how to make this service most effectively available. Where more adequate service has been provided in various parts of the country, however, the public has welcomed it. The initiation of a policy for equalizing library services seems, therefore, a prerequisite for bringing our present technological knowledge into line with the actual needs and interests of all the people, whether they live in metropolitan or rural areas.

Two alternative plans for increased state aid to local libraries recently established in New York State provide an opportunity for observing the dynamics of policy and administration in charting a program for equalizing a public service. The issues, political and governmental, in state-local relations in this fringe area of service are perhaps less articulated than in many others. They are not less real or potentially evocative of active political and administrative response.

Origins and Outlines of the Plans

The Regional Plan. The need for equalizing library services has been widely recognized in many states and various formulas have been devised. The New York Library Association requested the State Education Department to "make a complete study" of the problem in New York State as early as 1944. A broad survey of alternative methods was initiated by the Board of Regents (the governing body of the department) and the commissioner of education in response to this request.¹

This research study resulted in a proposal for a series of state-supported regional libraries

¹ The University of the State of New York, *Development of Library Services in New York State* (Albany: State Department of Education, Bulletin 1376, 1949).

to support and supplement existing local libraries in various ways. These regional centers were envisaged as conducting three direct activities: (1) centralized purchase of books and other library materials to be furnished to local libraries on loan; (2) promotion of interlibrary cooperation through a union catalog and interlibrary loans; and (3) provision of various advisory and professional services from the regional center to local libraries. Other activities, such as the operation of bookmobiles, might, it was proposed, be carried on by the centers on a contractual basis with the local and county governments in their respective regions.

Under the regional plan all costs of managing and operating the centers were to be borne by the state. Local and county units of government would pay no costs except for additional contractual services developed at their instigation. The initial cost of the proposed fourteen regional centers outside New York City was to be \$3,339,000, or a little more than \$0.50 per capita for the population to be served. At the same rate, allocation of state funds to New York City would amount to \$3,700,000, or a total of \$7,000,000 for the entire state.

Policy at the state level would obviously be determined by the central agency, the State Library. The extent of services available to local libraries would depend on the extent of state appropriations for the centers. If experience in other fields of state aid to local government is any criterion, it would be difficult to reduce appropriations once the program was under way; the trend is almost universally the opposite except in the face of a major economic recession.

Administration of the centers would similarly be directly under state control. Personnel would be selected and appointed by, and responsible to, the State Library.

In order to bridge the gap between central finance and management and local interest in administrative control, the regional plan provided for the appointment by county boards of supervisors of county boards of library development. These boards were to be composed of eleven members, serving without compensation, representative of all sections of the county. Regional boards, representative of county development boards, were also proposed to pro-

mote intercounty library cooperation within the regional area. The plan thus provided for a lay, nonpolitical agency as liaison between the politically oriented (elected) county board of supervisors and the administrative state agency, the regional center.

The advisory boards have not yet been established. They were no doubt considered as a useful insurance against political domination of an essentially professional service. It is doubtful, however, whether placing such a lay agency, without defined political or administrative responsibilities, in an advisory relationship to those county boards and the center staffs with recognized policy-making and operating functions would strengthen the impact of community attitudes on decisions of either type. Informed opinion might equally well be discovered through existing representative agencies, especially the education or library committees of county boards.

The 1940 population of the proposed fourteen regions was over 4,500,000, of which over 1,500,000 were without any library service. The 1950 population of upstate New York is 6,972,545. It is probable that the ratio of unserved population—in 1940 widely variant by counties, from 9 per cent in Westchester to 83 per cent in Orleans—has not substantially declined in the decade, as population has moved progressively out to the fringes of urban and metropolitan nuclei. The regions varied in population from 132,000 to 986,000. Six included central cities of over 100,000; five had a population of under 250,000. The radii from the proposed library centers to the perimeters of the regions ranged from 35 to 90 miles; only two were under 50 miles, only three over 80. Since all the regions were based on county lines, these disparities in population and area were inevitable.

The regional plan provided a formula for centralizing the library services that can be carried on most efficiently and economically under one roof. Multiple purchasing, cataloging, and handling of books, a centralized collection and distribution system, a union catalog, and a generalized interlibrary loan system would offer substantial advantages to all libraries, and especially to the smaller ones, throughout a region. The issue of direct state

interposition in local affairs—even in such a service as libraries—was recognized as a major factor in the success of the plan. The organizational scheme projected to meet this issue was designed to stimulate local initiative and participation in both policy and administration. Its effectiveness in insuring local interest and involvement could not, of course, be determined in advance. The vagueness of the lines of authority and responsibility—in the absence of actual experience—left unanswered many questions of policy and administration.

The Direct State-Aid Plan. An alternative to this plan, designed to insure local control, was not slow in making its appearance in Albany. The instinct for local policy-making and management was reflected in a bill providing for direct aid to county, or multiple-county, library systems. County plans, not uniform in pattern, had been developed and operated in at least four counties under local initiative and without direct state subsidy beyond generally existing grants to local libraries. Various groups in other counties were supporting the idea of countywide library systems. The movement received powerful political support from one of the top officers in the state administration who had some personal experience with the problem in one of the larger metropolitan regions. As a result of a combination of influences, the Governor appointed a fifteen-member Committee on Library Aid in 1949, made up of librarians, library trustees, and several state officials from relevant agencies. The committee reported on February 17, 1950;² and a bill incorporating the committee's proposals was introduced and passed by the Legislature. It became law on March 30, 1950 (L. 1950, ch. 273).

The new law followed precisely the recommendations of the Governor's committee for increased direct state aid to county, or multiple-county, library systems. Briefly, standards of eligibility were to be established by the Board of Regents; certain criteria were spelled out in the statute (sec. 272, §§ 6, 10). Provisional eligibility was authorized for county systems in the process of development.

Approved plans would entitle a countywide

library system to state aid at the rate of 50 per cent of the expenditures for books and periodicals (not to exceed \$150 for each 1,000 population); plus 50 per cent of this amount if the ordering, cataloging, and preparing of books and periodicals for circulation were centrally performed. In the case of multiple-county plans a recurring annual grant of \$5,000, and an initial nonrecurring grant of \$10,000, would be provided to each county. Provisionally approved plans would entitle the county or counties to one-half of these amounts for a maximum of three years. It was estimated that on the basis of \$0.225 per capita plus the recurring annual grants, total annual cost to the state would be \$3,650,000, or about one-half the cost of the regional plan if it were extended to the entire state.

The Regents were given broad discretion in establishing standards of eligibility for grants. The commissioner of education was to implement the standards through requirements of annual reports and powers of revocation. The withholding of 25 per cent of state aid payments was also made mandatory if local tax appropriations were reduced below the base year (1949) plus subsequent increased annual expenditures for books and periodicals. The statute itself required that any plan, to be approved, must insure every resident of the county or counties "without discrimination because of his place of residence . . . library service free of charge." This provision imposed the condition of actual countywide library service. Under the regional plan library service to nonserved areas was not envisaged as a regional center function except under contract with, and financial support by, county boards of supervisors.

The statute established no requirements as to the form or extent of county organization for or control of the library function. County boards were authorized to establish, and tax for the support of, a library or libraries; the statute was silent as to policy-making or management. The fact that alternative approaches to organization and operation of county library systems were already in existence may explain in part the absence of more precise prescriptions.

The Governor's committee had noted the possibility of "consolidated" and "fed-

² *Report of the Governor's Committee on Library Aid, 1950* (Albany, distributed by New York State Library, 1951).

erated" types of organization.³ The former would eventuate in a single countywide library system under which "existing libraries would surrender their charters and become branches of the county library." The latter would "provide an arrangement whereby a county library board would be established for the purpose of insuring a coordinated overall plan operating to secure reasonable and adequate library service for all the citizens of an area." Local libraries would determine the extent of their surrender of local management and finance to the county board which would, in any case, be responsible for providing services to unserved areas.

Here, the plan of the Governor's committee was even more vague than that of the Regents' as to the line of demarcation between county and local authority and responsibility for the library function. In effect, its suggestions on this point would only push the whole complex of problems implicit, perhaps inherent, in interlevel relations down one rung—from the state-county-local to the county-local level.

What can be said of the merits and defects of the two plans? Both are envisaged as at least potentially statewide in applicability; each has its advocates and opponents. It is not, indeed, impossible that the plans might become competitors for all-out political and professional support. Experience with both, although relatively brief and partial, offers some opportunity to appraise their comparative utility under varying economic and social conditions. How do the two plans "stack up" in resolving problems of policy and administration at this stage of their development?

The Plans in Action

After considerable study, it was decided to proceed with a regional pilot project in one of the regions proposed in the regional plan. The North Country region of Jefferson, Lewis, and St. Lawrence counties was selected; an initial appropriation of \$100,000 was made to establish the first regional library service center in Watertown in April, 1948. A preliminary tour

of the region by Regents and State Library representatives sought to make the project widely understood by local political, library, and civic leaders in the three counties.

In the spring of 1951 the author made a survey to determine the relative merits of the regional and the direct state-aid plan from political and administrative points of view. It covered the North Country region and three countywide plans operating under the 1950 state-aid law. Interviews were held with a representative cross-section of the leadership in all areas—members of the Legislature, the county boards of supervisors, county and local administrative officials, librarians and library trustees, educators, and business, professional, and civic organization leaders.

The Regional Center. In the North Country region interviews were held with people living in cities (only four of over 10,000 population), towns, and open-country farming areas. Interviews were informal, with some questions on particular points but with an effort to get an over-all appraisal of the merits and defects of the system. The remarkable unanimity in the appraisal of the problems of policy and administration resulting from the establishment of the center is perhaps one of the most significant aspects of the findings. There is practically a consensus throughout the region and among representatives of every group interest.

The most "political" issue is, no doubt, state control of both the policy and the administration of the center. It represents state operation and staffing of a function traditionally under local control. Even in a low-cost function (compared with education, highways, or relief), was this state action viewed with alarm?

The answer of the interviewees was a strong negative. The idea that the center might be an unwelcome extension of the welfare-state attrition of local initiative was not once put forward as an argument against utility of the center. If in the course of conversation this idea was suggested, it was always vigorously rejected. In this predominately rural region, it was frankly recognized that the center provided services beyond the tax capacity of any of the counties. Following study of the two plans two of the three county boards took specific action within the past year in favor of the regional plan. The positive response

³ The committee also envisaged the possibility of a county library "association" with complete local library autonomy but with possible contractual relations. As it well says, "the practical and administrative difficulties in this form of organization are yet to be explored."

to the state-supported and administered center was attributed in large part to the effective methods of the staff in serving the needs and interests of the local libraries in the region. No fear was expressed—as it was about some other state-aid programs—that local initiative and interest would be depleted; many examples of the opposite effect were offered. Increases in local appropriations for library support, increased use of libraries stocked with newer and wider selections, and more active community interest in library management were, indeed, general throughout the region over the three-year period.⁴

A second question relates to both policy and administration. Does the center plan allow for local initiative and participation in the operating aspects of the program? On the basis of what has occurred in the pilot project, the answer is clearly in the affirmative. Several aspects of the matter may be noted briefly.

First, the formula in the regional plan of a county library development board apparently is not essential to insure local initiative and participation. The three county boards of supervisors act directly through their education committees to watch, to advise, and to stimulate further library facilities. Certainly outside the metropolitan areas, there seems little need for interposing a part-time lay agency between the responsible political and administrative officials of the county and the state agency providing a service which writes off direct costs to the local taxpayers. The library function seems to be sufficiently nonpolitical in purpose and operation not to require this kind of buffer in order to insure its treatment by the politically responsible county board as outside politics.

Second, the center has followed the policy of securing local consent before undertaking operations. Books have been ordered and distributed on the basis of local library requests. Cataloging and other professional services have been performed for local libraries only on request; many have, in fact, contracted for processing their own book purchases. Early doubts about participation by a few of the smaller libraries have been dispelled by the center's policy of waiting for local initiative to

develop. The requirement of a regional inter-library-loan system as a prerequisite to joining the plan, at first viewed negatively by a few libraries, has now been generally accepted—on the basis of obvious advantage to all.

Finally, the center's sponsorship of intra-regional conferences of librarians, trustees, and civic leaders has stimulated more active interest and participation not only in local library but also in library center planning and development. Interest has cumulated to a marked degree among leaders throughout the region; they exhibit greater interest in library service than in other smaller public services in the area.

Thus, three years after its establishment, and probably long before this, the regional library center has become an accepted institution throughout the region.

The Direct State-Aid Plan. The three already existing countywide library plans that are operating under the 1950 law are Chemung, Erie, and Schenectady counties.⁵ Two of these counties are predominately metropolitan in character; Chemung County is generally rural but contains a city of over 50,000 (Elmira) which has the only public library in the county. Each of the three countywide plans was in the gestative stage prior to the enactment of the 1950 law.

A number of factors contributed to acceptance of the state-aid plans in these counties. The provisions of the law were designed to secure acceptance.⁶ The central cities in each of the three counties were at, or approaching, their statutory tax limits. The city authorities were consequently desirous of divesting themselves of any possible items in their budgets, however small. In two of the counties, party control was identical in the city and the county; the transfer was facilitated by this situation. A close vote in the third county board crossed party

⁴ In Monroe County a county library functions directly under the board of supervisors and is unrelated politically or administratively with the Rochester and other public libraries in the county. It was inaugurated some years ago, primarily to provide library facilities to unserved areas and is neither an integrated nor a federated system.

⁵ The requirement of a minimum of five professional librarians in the county system was no bar to acceptance in any of these counties, as it would have been in at least two of the North Country counties.

⁶ Cf. *Interim Report on the Watertown Experiment, April 1, 1948 to July 1950* (Division of Research, N. Y. State Education Department, n.d., unpublished).

lines; it appears to have been affected by an intra-party dispute going on at the time on other matters. So far as "politics" is concerned, there is little evidence that it was an important factor, except as to city-county tax capacity, in the adoption of the state-aid plan in any of these cases.⁷

In two counties "politics" seems also to have been an unimportant factor in the policy-making and management aspects of library operations since the adoption of the plan. In Chemung County the absence of other public libraries made the administration of the system by the Elmira library almost inevitable. Countywide service could be organized rather easily and effectively as a single unit. In the case of Schenectady, the city and county lines were more nearly coterminous than in the other two counties. Several small libraries outside the city were organized essentially as branches. Many of the residents of nearby unserved suburban areas were already accustomed to using the central library and were in favor of generalizing both its services and its financing.

The situation in Erie County has been complicated by the existence of two public (originally private) libraries in Buffalo, as well as a number of fairly strong libraries in suburban communities. The creation of the Erie County Public Library has not yet resulted in an amalgamation of the two Buffalo and the smaller outlying libraries into a consolidated or a truly federated type of county organization. Efforts to bring about amalgamation have failed once; the success of a current attempt is said by some to depend on the outcome of city-county elections.⁸

⁷ As of July 1, 1951, tentative plans for countywide library systems under the 1950 law have been drafted in four other counties and are being discussed by the libraries concerned. The state-aid plan is being considered in the pre-draft stage in some twenty-two other counties; by no means all are initially favorable to the countywide system.

⁸ The "principle" of the independence of library administration from political control by the county board is being vigorously defended by the older libraries. They insist on a separate board of trustees (actually now in existence) for the county library; one disputed issue is apparently whether on the first board appointed after amalgamation the older libraries shall be represented as such.

In all three counties, there is, in effect, a county library board of trustees. It is explicitly a county board in Erie County; in the other two counties the boards of the major libraries continue to function actively. The three county boards of supervisors appoint a library committee from their membership; this committee serves as the liaison between the county board and the library board. In all three counties, the county board takes an active interest in the operations of the countywide system; to date, no evidence of political interposition in library management has appeared.

The county boards of supervisors have a statutory responsibility for appropriating library funds. In Erie County a still moot policy question is whether the library shall be treated as a "department" of the county government subject to preaudit and other fiscal controls. Formally, this is not now its status. Informally, there seems to be considerable tacit recognition by the library management of county supervision in fiscal matters. In all three counties, the library staff is either fully integrated into the county personnel system, or is on the way to complete integration.

As already noted, the major policy issue which arises about the countywide library system is whether the problems of inter-level relations can be successfully resolved. In two of the counties surveyed, problems of county-local relations hardly exist because of their library, geographical, and population patterns. In Erie County (and this is true of most of the metropolitan regions) the presence of a number of strong libraries with long traditions of local autonomy complicates the creation of a consolidated or a federated system. Practically all of the issues of policy and administration in state-county relations are reflected at the county-local level, and at this level do not seem to lose in intensity or viability.

Interviewees in the three counties recognized, explicitly or implicitly, that the issues were present. Not less than under the regional plan, their resolution will depend on the degree of mutual confidence and respect that develops between the responsible political and administrative officers. Only further experience will reveal how far the countywide plan can successfully give effective expression to the

instinct for local autonomy. The resolution of this question will depend in large measure on the quality of the administrative services offered to local libraries by the county library. In all three counties, there seems to be substantial satisfaction on this score. As in the case of the regional center, appreciation of the services rendered seems to be widespread and rising. The requirement of countywide services to unserved areas is a factor of considerable significance in accelerating acceptance of the plan. It remains an unresolved problem in the regional plan—without considerable additional expenditure by the counties in the region.

What of the Future?

New York has embarked on a positive policy of state aid to local libraries. To what degree does each of the plans meet local needs?

Of the fifty-seven counties outside New York City, only six have a population of over 250,000; of these two (Nassau and Westchester) are adjacent to New York City and part of one (Suffolk) is increasingly a New York City suburban area. Of the remaining fifty-one counties, only eight have a population of 100,000; twenty-seven have under 51,000. These counties are scattered throughout the state; some are contiguous to or near a metropolitan county. The multiple-county formula in the state-aid law might meet the needs of half a dozen or so of these counties; it could not, for most of them, provide a sufficient tax base for adequate service to large unserved or existing small-library areas.⁹

For many regions of the state, it seems illusory to expect that the direct state-aid plan will, in any calculable future, insure adequate library service to all the people. If the cultural, professional, and community values of public library service are to be achieved for the 2,000,000 people who have no or only limited access to libraries, direct state service to existing libraries and to potential library users seems indispensable. The regional plan for a series of regional centers would seem to need to be sup-

plemented by some method of reaching the unserved areas. Many interviewees in the existing region indicated this need. The regional plan probably should not be extended to many of the metropolitan counties, or perhaps to many of the regions with a population of over 150,000-200,000. Additional regions where early development of centers similar to that in the North Country is needed can be identified on the basis of population and tax capacity.

Population distribution and tax capacity offer two criteria for defining areas suitable for additional regional libraries. Other considerations emerge from this survey. First, the "political" factor of local autonomy is not necessarily diminished by establishing a county-controlled library system. The issues inherent in the desire for local autonomy are merely pushed one step downward in the hierarchy of governmental units. County control of a locally utilized service does not eliminate the impact of this factor at the lower level. The regional plan offers, apparently, sufficient recognition of the tradition of local autonomy by its emphasis on local initiative (through county boards and local libraries) in developing its relations with and services to the people of the region through their representative agencies. The countywide (direct state-aid) plan does not avoid the problem, or necessarily make it less intense. Nor does it insure greater conformity in policy to local interests and needs.

Second, in the operation of the two plans, the degree of acceptance of either seems to depend on the confidence and understanding developed by the administrators in dealing with local-county authorities on the one hand and the publics they serve on the other. The fact that the regional plan involves personnel and management stemming from the state and not the county level does not reduce its acceptance by the community. Nor does the direct state-aid plan insure the absence of administrative frictions within the area.

The two plans for state assistance in the development of library services would seem to be complementary, not competitive. Each poses problems in intergovernmental relations whose solution depends largely on the sensitivity of the administering personnel to a major working rule of sound administration—direct and perceptive relations with the clientele.

⁹ A proposed multiple-county unit is being considered in one of the three existing county systems; responsible county officials are opposed because of the substantial additional costs which would fall on the parent county in providing required services to the others. The factor of division of costs will no doubt affect decisions on every proposed multiple-county plan.

Problems of Top Management: A Panel Discussion

EDITORS' NOTE: On December 16, 1948, the following panel participated in a discussion before the Organization and Methods Conference of the U.S. Department of Agriculture of the question "What are the important administrative problems of the Department of Agriculture and its agencies, as seen by top management?": Albert J. Loveland, Under Secretary of Agriculture; P. V. Cardon, administrator, Agricultural Research Administration; Lyle F. Watts, chief, Forest Service; and Claude R. Wickard, administrator, Rural Electrification Administration. With the consent of the participants a major part of this panel discussion is here reproduced. Their comments seem as timely today as when they were originally made.

Mr. Loveland. I think the subject today is very important. I hope we'll have a good discussion among the panel members, and then good questions from the group. I'll repeat the subject: "What are the important administrative problems of the Department and its agencies, as seen by top management?" I think it's important for us to sit down once in a while and check up on where we've been, where we are today, and where we're going. I'm going to direct the first question to Mr. Wickard: How to get the employees of an organization to understand its purposes and objectives—why certain things are being done and why they are being done a certain way; how to find out what operating problems employees down the line or in the field are up against, and what suggestions they can make. Claude?

Mr. Wickard. Well, Mr. Secretary, I believe that I was the one who suggested this question. My first comment perhaps grows out of a little experience that I have had in the last few days—that is, getting and keeping the kind of people I would like to have work for my organization. I realize that I can't say too much about that or complain too much when I have six or seven of my employees here. It might not seem too complimentary for me to say that I'm hav-

ing a lot of trouble along that line. But I am. At this time yesterday, I was informed that a man we had hoped to get to replace another man who has left us was not coming with us because he had found a better job some place else in the meantime. I found out just before I came in that another man, who I think is very efficient, has had another offer outside.

Now, if I just had all the good men I wanted, I wouldn't have any administrative problems—they would all disappear. As a matter of fact, I sometimes think maybe my job would disappear. So if I were to say right this minute what's bothering me the most, I would say it is this problem.

But now I'll go back to your question, this question of trying to get before the staff of an organization, and keep before them, the real objectives of that organization. I think you have said, Mr. Secretary, that one of your troubles, one which I think all of us have experienced, is that too often we get submerged in details and get to handling things mechanically, and people don't have brought to them the real objectives of what they're trying to do and how their particular assignment fits into a pattern of accomplishment. How to get the work done and how to be efficient, and at the same time have the enthusiasm which can come only from knowing what you're doing and why you're doing it, is a very difficult problem. How to get an understanding of objectives from one administrative level down to another administrative level is awfully difficult.

It is an equally difficult problem to find out what our field people and the public we serve are thinking, what ideas and suggestions they have, and what problems they are up against. The thinking out in the field needs to come back up to the top and become a part of the whole process of formulating and developing our programs. We need to get a two-way relationship, a two-way communication between

the administrator and the fellow out there who has to do the job. A few can do the administering, but somebody has to do the job out in the field. How to keep those two fully aware of each other's problems and progress is one of the most difficult things that I know of.

Mr. Loveland. You've certainly stated the problem, Mr. Wickard. It's very real to all of us. Would any of the other members of the panel care to comment about this problem?

Mr. Watts. I think I would, Mr. Secretary, because I think it's one of the most difficult problems that an administrator has to deal with—how to get your organization to understand and appreciate the objectives for which we're working. We have tried a good many devices in the Forest Service to accomplish that. I think it must begin when you hire a new man. When we hire a group of professional people, the first step is orientation. We approach that in two ways. One is through group meetings that are designed for orientation, and the other is by assignment of the new man to a specially qualified forest ranger or other supervisor with whom he will work for perhaps a year or so to become indoctrinated with the objectives of the Service. That's only the first step, of course, because the problem is with you all the time.

After that, I think, it has to do with the way policies and objectives are arrived at. In the Forest Service, we like to think that policy-making is participated in from the grass roots on up. I'll illustrate by reference to the grazing controversy of the last few years. Our policy was arrived at through ranger meetings in which the grazing situation was discussed forward and back and then carried on up to the regional office level where the national forest supervisors were called in and the problem was discussed. From there it was taken on in to the Washington office where we had a meeting of our regional foresters and experiment station directors to discuss what we should do about the situation, which we all knew to be bad. With that basis, we decided that it would be given top priority in our annual work plans.

Now, I think that the result of this process was that every one from the ranger, to the forest supervisor, to the regional office, as well as here at headquarters, realized what we

wanted to drive at—namely, watershed protection. And then in order to give additional emphasis to it through the chief's office, we initiated what we called the "know your watersheds" program, and sent down through the organization all of the information and helpful advice that we could give. I believe that we've done a fairly good job. It's slow, but it's certainly a question of knowing what your objectives are and how to go about achieving them. It can't be forced down from the top—it just can't be—and, therefore, you've got to work both ways and approach it gradually.

Mr. Loveland. Dr. Cardon, do you have any observations?

Dr. Cardon. I'm quite in agreement with what Lyle has said in endorsing the views projected by Claude Wickard about understanding the objectives of an agency.

If it's agreeable, I would like to lead into the question of interrelationships between agencies, because the same type of problem on a different scale exists there. Briefly, I would like to pose this as my statement of the problem: How to develop objective appreciation of the interrelationships of departmental activities.

The importance of this problem becomes increasingly apparent as you think of it. We all work for the same institution. This institution was created and is maintained by the people of the United States for a high purpose, the promotion of national welfare through the betterment of agriculture and rural living. In carrying out this purpose, the department has many activities. These activities are the responsibilities of various bureaus and agencies. Each of us works for one or another of these bureaus or agencies. The natural and commendable interest of each of us is to make our particular agency as effective as possible. But often we lose sight of the fact that maximum effectiveness of any unit of an organization is realized only when all parts are functioning in unison.

Now think of your own office, section, bureau, branch, or agency as a part of the mechanism we call the Department of Agriculture. You want to make your part as effective as possible in fulfilling its particular function—that is essential. But to be most effective in helping the department to fulfill its

total function, you must realize that there are other parts to this mechanism, and that all parts must be synchronized—integrated for coordinated action. This calls for the objective appreciation of interrelationships, and my question is: How can such appreciation be developed?

I'm not here to answer my own question, even if I could. I merely suggest that in the Agricultural Research Administration we are agreed that there is need for common understanding of our major purpose, for more forward thinking on objectives to be attained, for more joint consideration of tasks to be performed, and for more concerted action toward common ends. But we need to relate the research functions to other functions of the department. Moreover, we need to relate our activities to comparable activities of other units of government, both federal and state. How may this be best accomplished? It's a big and important job. It's my job, it's your job, and it's everybody's job who is interested in promoting effectiveness over the organization as a whole. It calls for continuous and consistent effort. I welcome now, or at any time, comments as to how this question might be answered effectively throughout our organization.

Mr. Loveland. Is there any comment on what Dr. Cardon just said?

Mr. Watts. While Vince has been talking I've been trying to think of the most effective device to bring about coordination at the departmental level since I have had acquaintance with the department. I think, Mr. Secretary, the most effective device was the committee setup to work out the long-range agricultural program which we presented to Congress in 1947. There we did work together in the various bureaus, and we just had to know what the other bureaus were driving at. In working out the report which was put before the two congressional committees, all bureaus had to work pretty much as a team. I think we could use a great deal more of the sort of teamwork that went into the long-range program.

Mr. Loveland. Thank you, Mr. Watts. I think we realize there is a problem of integration of agencies, and we should all keep our-

selves in a position, even though we're connected with one particular agency, to go out and support and boost for the other agencies. As I understand it, though, this discussion is to bring out the problems, and other groups will be set up by the conference to seek the answers. Anything further, Mr. Wickard?

Mr. Wickard. I want to say, Lyle, that I agree with your statement that the planning work that was done by a large group on the long-range agricultural program did help the people who were doing it, but I'd have to ask how many people down at the lower levels were fully aware of all that was found out by the persons who happened to be assigned to that particular job. How to get a thing like that down to different administrative levels is still another problem.

I might ask Vince a question. Until a few years ago there were a number of separate research bureaus in the department. Now, we have your office, which is coordinating the research work. That was brought about, you remember, by complaints by members of Congress and others that there was overlapping and duplication, and I think sometimes there was an accusation that people were keeping work going indefinitely when it should have been finished. Has the establishment of the Agricultural Research Administration helped, in your opinion, in the coordination of the research agencies?

Dr. Cardon. In reply to that question, Claude, I should say, yes. I think the greatest contribution of the Administration has been to afford the opportunity, which has been taken advantage of on every occasion, for joint consideration of problems by the research bureaus. That has been extremely useful in giving clearer direction to the activities and in having more clearly conceived objectives where there are interrelationships between bureaus.

I do not feel that we have entirely overcome duplication, and I don't think duplication in and of itself is a serious thing if it's done deliberately and for purposes of making necessary checks and insuring adequacy of coverage of a problem. But I do think that there has been a great development of integration and cooperation and effective joint approach. That

is something that is in addition to the mere paper handling of projects.

It is my feeling that the great need we still have, although we are making progress, is for time free from the hectic hullabaloo and eleventh hour rush of budgetary projects, personnel procedures, and all the other administrative routines—to have opportunity to think as to what objectives and horizons we want to have out before us as a guide to our activities, and then relate our joint thinking to them. Then the paper work, the project outlines, and things of that character fall into a pattern of joint evaluation of the objective and become a relatively minor consideration. The big thing that is needed is the development of horizons. That we still need to do more effectively. But as we attempt to do it, we find ourselves trying to dig out from under a whole lot of other things.

Mr. Loveland. Thank you, Dr. Cardon. That carries us right over to another problem, which I'd like to direct to you, Mr. Watts: The burden which administrative requirements, regulations, reports, and so forth, put upon program operations.

Mr. Watts. I'm glad you asked that question, Mr. Secretary, because it's always with us. I think it's a question that may be well directed to the conference which sponsored this round table. Although it's on a much lower level than the one we've been on, it is of tremendous importance. I'm speaking of the time-consuming energy that it takes on the part of the field force to do the housekeeping and the report making and the record keeping that we build up for ourselves. It's especially important to the Forest Service because much of our work comes down to an individual ranger on a ranger district who probably doesn't have even a clerk. He does it by himself, and it takes too much of the time that could be given to constructive work.

Quite frankly, I am thinking of personnel management and the paper shuffling that we find our men having to do in that field. Now, I'm all for personnel management, but the personnel managers, too largely, haven't time for much constructive thinking about recruiting, training, and holding better personnel.

They are busy with techniques, and methods, and so on. We folks in administration had better think about that.

Another thing is the matter of equipment. I'm sure an equipment engineer could convince you that we do not keep enough records, but bear in mind that, through law or our own regulations, we have to keep detailed records of everything that is done with an individual passenger-carrying automobile or a bulldozer or other equipment. Sometimes you go onto a ranger district and find the ranger devoting more time to such things than he is to how he is marking his timber. You may find him spending thirty per cent of his time tied down to an office. Every device possible should be used to relieve him of such details so that he can give his thought to better management of the land, rather than how to keep better records.

Mr. Loveland. I think that's fine. Are there any comments, Dr. Cardon or Mr. Wickard?

Mr. Wickard. Well, there's one thing that perhaps isn't fully appreciated by the people outside government, and that is that in government you are working for the public and you've got to keep records that are pretty exact. We have a lot of complaints from our people because they have to give us such detail on travel, as for instance, on personally-owned automobiles, or where they spent the night, and what not. Well, it looks like we are conducting a personal investigation when we ask for all of these things. But yet, you've got to have certain requirements. Now, I don't disagree with you, and I think that you can carry this thing too far and it is carried too far. But still, we have a certain obligation to the public that everything be accounted for as a matter of record. You've got to have some kind of compromise between the two extremes, I think.

Mr. Watts. I agree with that, of course, Mr. Wickard. I just want to impress on those who handle these matters that they shouldn't go farther in building up office detail than need be to do a good job of satisfying the public.

Dr. Cardon. I would certainly agree that there is need for procedures that will insure to

the public a proper accounting for funds and for equipment. However, it seems to me that there must be in this, as in everything else, a point of diminishing returns. Regardless of how important it is to have these procedures, it would be well to keep in mind the question of whether or not it's necessary to go farther and farther, or whether there is a point of diminishing returns beyond which the controls, the checks and balances, cost everyone concerned more money or more time or more attention than is required in order to do a good job of accounting.

Mr. Loveland. Thank you, Dr. Cardon. Being recently from the field, I know something about this problem of reports, requested by Washington from the state people, and by the state people from the county people. We used to be very critical, in our Iowa office, in regard to some of the reports the people in Washington asked us for. Then we would sit down once in a while and add up the reports we were asking from our county offices, and sometimes we would find we were asking them for an average of a report a day or more. I think that every one of us should look over that situation and see if they're all necessary reports.

I'd like to state another problem. I think that it's important; it is to me, anyway. It's this: How to arrange our work so that we have time to think and plan ahead. I touched on that in my opening remarks. One of my problems is not to spend all my time catching the ball but to take time to sit down and plan and look ahead. To me that is one of the great problems we have in administrative work, and I think some studies along that line could be of great benefit.

Mr. Wickard. I think what you say is true. Chester Davis used to say all we did around here was pour oil on the wheel that was squeaking, and apparently there was a new one squeaking every day. In other words, we weren't watching exactly where we were driving the vehicle, we were just trying to keep it rolling and keep it from squeaking too much. There is that problem in every office, in every organization, I suspect, inside or outside of government, and to divide properly the amount of time available between execution

and planning is a very hard thing. The planning part is sometimes more important than anything else. But in order to plan properly you have to have some method of appraising what the problems are and what you're doing about them, and whether you're doing it in the right way, which comes back to what we said at first—that is, how to get people out of the details enough to see where they are going and whether they are making a contribution.

One other thing I would like to say goes back to some of our earlier discussion, too. I suspect most of the criticism directed at the agencies and the Department of Agriculture is based upon misunderstanding or ignorance on the part of the public. Now, I think that's true. Who is going to explain things to the public? Well, you can make speeches, but the contacts that people have who represent the Department of Agriculture in the field are the most valuable means of getting people to understand what we are trying to do. Now, suppose somebody out there is asked, "What in the world are you doing this for?" If he says, "Well, I don't know—it looks like foolishness to me too," he's done a mighty poor job of selling his program. You can see the impatience that is created.

As I see it, it all comes back to this matter of understanding objectives. If you have understanding, then you can do some planning; and if you don't have throughout your agency, and particularly at the top, the time to think about what you're doing, what you're going to do, how you're going to improve, how you're going to serve the public better, you probably will find that you are not doing a good job of serving the public.

Mr. Loveland. I can remember back home my Dad used to say, when we'd be choring around the barn and I'd get to running in circles, "What you lack in the head you must make up with your heels." I've thought of that many times. Do you have any other questions along this line, Dr. Cardon?

Dr. Cardon. Following up what Claude Wickard said about field relationships, it seems to me that that is one of the important things to which we should all devote much more attention—how to get into the minds of field

workers a clear understanding of what is done in the Washington offices. In a department where we have such far-flung, numerous field forces, one of the very important things is to find ways of keeping them advised as to the objectives, as to the purposes, as to the needs for doing things. Frequently, I think, we formulate something, we send the fieldmen a copy, and then we expect them to interpret our "gobbledygook" in such a way that they will go ahead and do a good job. From my own experience as a field man, I would feel that one of the very difficult problems, and one of the most important, is how to keep the field forces advised.

Mr. Loveland. Thank you, Dr. Cardon. I'm sure there's meat in what you've just said. I'd like to direct one more question to you, Mr. Watts: How to get people to delegate authority to others, and to get those to whom authority is delegated to assume their responsibility?

Mr. Watts. That is a problem that's tremendously important to the Forest Service because, by the very nature of our job, which goes from Puerto Rico to Alaska and into forty-two states, with the work on the ground handled primarily by 750 rangers, you've got to delegate authority. It isn't very difficult to delegate authority. It's fairly easy. But it is pretty darn difficult to delegate it in such a way that you can hold the man to whom it's delegated accountable for the things that he does under that delegation. We have about 25,000 grazing permits a year and something like 20,000 timber sales a year in the Forest Service, yet we never see a grazing permit in the Washington office, unless there is an appeal of some kind. The only timber sales that we see in Washington are a handful or two of the very big ones, or those that involve changes in policy. After policy is determined, we pass the authority for individual cases on out to the regional foresters, and they in turn to the forest supervisors, and they to the rangers for different size jobs.

I think the only answer that I have to this tremendously important problem goes back to the first statement that I made, and the one that Claude has talked about. It rests on your field personnel understanding what you're driving at, what your policy is, what your objectives are. With that and with follow-up and

inspection, you may have fairly good success. But it's always a problem to delegate authority, as we must, so that someone down the line is not going to misunderstand the delegation or perhaps abuse it.

Mr. Loveland. I think another thing that's important is, do we hesitate to delegate authority because we think we're going to build someone else to take our place, or fear that someone else would be better than we are. But if we can't as administrators help build people who will be better than we, much better than we, I think we're missing a bet.

I'd like to direct one more question to Mr. Wickard: How to get employees to appreciate the importance of being courteous and helpful in dealing with the public, both in correspondence and in personal contacts, and the importance of giving the public information which will enable it to understand what the organization is trying to accomplish. Now, the last part of that we have probably covered. But the first part I don't believe we have, that is, how to have employees appreciate the importance of being courteous and helpful to the public.

Mr. Wickard. Well, frankly, I don't have a very good answer to that question. One of the most difficult problems that I have is to get people in answering letters to set down in a clear, concise, and complete paragraph or two an answer to a question which is, perhaps, technical or pretty controversial. It seems to me it is rather easy to write a six-page explanation of almost anything. By the time the reader gets through the third page, he is pretty well confused, and maybe that is what the writer intended. But to set down in half a page an answer to an inquiry from a Congressman or somebody else who's asking for information, or maybe complaining, is a very difficult thing, and I think that perhaps we don't give enough attention to it.

Of course, answering letters is not the only thing. We've got people who are going out to talk to groups or who are going out to conferences. How to get those people to take the time to think through the questions brought to them and give the public prompt, courteous, concise answers is one of the worst problems that I have had to deal with in all the years that

I have been in the department. I don't know the answer to it. I wish there could be maybe a little more work done on that throughout the department, and maybe in my own particular agency. We've tried various schemes to improve this matter of answering of correspondence.

Thousands and thousands of letters come in to the Department, and I don't know how many hundreds come in to REA—there must be several hundred a day. To answer those letters as they should be answered is a difficult problem. And we might as well put the cards on the table—a lot of our mail is from Congress, and that comes first. Yet Congress doesn't see why we have to spend so much money on administrative services and a lot of the other things that are involved in taking care of all the requests from Congress for information, statistics, and so on. I don't have the answer to it. It's something I don't suppose anybody will ever get a complete answer to. Maybe this group here can think about some way or some type of organization which can take care of correspondence and other things in the information field so that people are given proper answers.

Mr. Loveland. I visited a county office a short time ago. A beautiful young lady met me at the desk and was very courteous, and as I walked back into the other part of the office a farmer came in with a problem. He came into this office in his work clothes, just as I have visited county offices many times when I was in town for repairs or something of that sort. And this young lady proceeded to raise her head in the air and treat this customer very disrespectfully. It hurt me tremendously. And I couldn't help but think that this farmer would judge the Department of Agriculture by the treatment he received in the office that morning.

Now, we would like to have questions from the group.

The question has just been asked whether members of the panel feel that finding out what's going on in their organizations in the field in carrying out programs is an important problem.

Dr. Cardon. Well, we certainly would welcome knowing at all times what's going on in

the field. We do have some devices in the way of reporting services from the field to keep us advised, so far as reports are concerned. We also have frequent visits by staff members from Washington and field headquarters out to working points in the field. We do try to keep in touch. The formal reports, frequently, however, do not report all of the thinking and the hunches and ideas that field forces have. Those are important things and I think the formalized reports do not often reflect them. I think that any steps that could be taken to improve contact with the field forces in any agency as to what is going on and get some real suggestions from them would always be welcome.

Mr. Loveland. The question has been asked, if I can state it correctly "What about exchange of personnel between the Washington office, say, and the field offices of an agency, and exchange of personnel between agencies?" Who wants to answer that one? Mr. Watts?

Mr. Watts. With regard to the first point, the idea of detailing men to the Washington office for short periods (and it's usually to do work that needs to be done anyhow), it's a device we've used a great deal. It's rather expensive, but it's very worth while. With regard to the exchange of personnel between bureaus, I'd want to think about that a little while. I think it has limited possibilities but I don't believe it's the best device for getting the objectives of the different bureaus understood by their sister bureaus. It has some possibilities, but I haven't thought it through.

Mr. Wickard. Mr. Watts, I might say that we've found the suggestion about bringing people in from the field very helpful in our organization. I notice every once in a while somebody comments, "Well, this fellow has been out about long enough. Better get him in for a few weeks." I don't know, though, if we've ever tried the reverse process—"This fellow has been in here about long enough. Maybe we better get him out for a while." Have you tried that?

Mr. Watts. Yes, Mr. Wickard, we do with the youngsters. But when you get as old as some of us, it wouldn't be safe. We couldn't quite do the job in the field any more.

Mr. Wickard. We might not get back.

Mr. Loveland. I think that's a good suggestion—

Mr. Watts. You mean, that we never get back?

Mr. Loveland. No, I mean the suggestion that it would be well for some of us who have been here for some little time to get back to the field.

Now, the time is short and I'm just going to ask just one more question. What advice would members of the panel give this group of administrative management people. Is there any advice, Mr. Watts, you can think of quickly?

Mr. Watts. For this particular group, I believe the most constructive advice I could give

is to streamline the organization with regard to the administrative functions in order to increase the time available to field men for the operating job that they are hired to do.

Mr. Loveland. Fine. Dr. Cardon?

Dr. Cardon. Well, I think the only comment that I could offer just off the cuff would be to strive to understand the major functions of an organization, and not get lost in procedures as to how to conform to procedures that have been devised by procedure manufacturers.

Mr. Wickard. After thinking for a number of years about the work you people have been doing in the Department, the best advice I can give is "Don't get discouraged." I think you're making progress all the time.

Reviews of Books and Documents

Studies in the Administration of United States Foreign Affairs

By Royden Dangerfield, University of Illinois

THE ADMINISTRATION OF AMERICAN FOREIGN AFFAIRS, by James L. McCamy. Alfred A. Knopf, 1950. Pp. 364. \$4.00.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND OVERSEAS OPERATIONS; A REPORT PREPARED FOR THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, by the Brookings Institution. Government Printing Office, 1951. Pp. 380. \$1.00.

UNITED STATES ADMINISTRATION OF ITS INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC AFFAIRS, by Wallace Judson Parks. The Johns Hopkins Press, 1951. Pp. 315. \$5.00.

I

THE three volumes listed above are the best and most complete of a small flood of studies having to do with the administration of American foreign relations which have appeared during the past few years.¹ These recent studies differ greatly from the crop of studies which appeared in the two decades following

¹ For an extensive treatment of the books here under review and others see Arthur W. Macmahon, "The Administration of Foreign Affairs," 45 *American Political Science Review* 836-66 (September, 1951).

Other recent books in the field include:

Kurt London (with the collaboration of Kent Ives), *How Foreign Policy Is Made* (D. Van Nostrand, 1949). A rather pedestrian attempt to compare the methods of policy formulation and execution in the United States and other states within the more customary framework of the executive-legislative relationships and foreign office organization.

Lawrence H. Chamberlain and Richard C. Snyder, *American Foreign Policy* (Rinehart, 1948). A very valuable compilation of readings covering the entire field of the conduct of foreign relations.

Elmer Plischke, *Conduct of American Diplomacy* (D. Van Nostrand, 1950). An excellent text, traditionally oriented but containing much material on the administration of foreign policy.

Robert A. Dahl, *Congress and Foreign Policy* (Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1950). A study of the "new pat-

tern of policy-making" represented by congressional action in the field of foreign policy.

World War I. The earlier research was concerned with the constitutional powers of the President, the Senate, and the Congress and centered in large part around the treaty-making process, the "control" of foreign policy, and the "conduct" of foreign relations. In the later thirties and the early years of World War II, scholars were more concerned with the role of the executive agreement and the power of the President to use this instrument in place of treaties.

The concern of the studies of the period since World War II has been "with the administration of foreign affairs in terms of organization of the government, the people who do the work, and the consequences of the work done by people in organization. Observers of public administration . . . tend to think the way executive agencies are organized and conducted has a direct relevance to the product of their work."²

There are many reasons for the new emphasis, but the more apparent include the new role of the United States in world politics, the experience of the war period, the postwar experience with foreign aid, the growth in size of the departments and agencies concerned with foreign relations, the increased importance of defense problems in the field of foreign relations, and the current interest in im-

tern of policy-making" represented by congressional action in the field of foreign policy.

Lester Markel (ed.), *Public Opinion and Foreign Policy* (Council on Foreign Relations, 1949). Nine essays on the formulation and execution of foreign policy from the point of view of the effect of public opinion and the influencing of it.

Gabriel A. Almond, *The American People and Foreign Policy* (Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1950). A useful study of the competence of the American public and the role it plays in the formulation of foreign policy.

² James L. McCamy, *The Administration of American Foreign Affairs*, p. vii.

proving the organizational pattern of the executive branch.

The wave of interest in this area began in the war period, with the Bureau of the Budget and the administrative planning divisions of the Department of State and the war agencies becoming concerned with better organizational patterns for the conduct of the various foreign policy aspects of war activities. The first of the studies were made by the government agencies.³ After the war, the liquidation of war agencies and the transfer of staff and functions to the Department of State led to still further study.⁴

A ground-breaking article was that of Arthur W. Macmahon on "International Policy and Governmental Structure," which appeared in 1948.⁵ *The Final Report on Foreign Aid* of the so-called Herter Committee dealt with organizational and administrative problems involved in foreign aid,⁶ as did the report to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations prepared by the Brookings Institution.⁷ The Report of the Hoover Commission on foreign affairs and the task force report were careful ef-

forts at facing up to the administrative problems in the field of foreign relations.⁸

II

JAMES L. McCamy, in his *The Administration of American Foreign Affairs*, has undertaken a pioneering study of the whole field of executive action in the area of foreign policy. He deals with the wide variety of activities now embraced within the field of foreign policy and undertakes to describe the roles played by the many departments and agencies concerned. He analyzes the devices for coordination of the activities of the various agencies and comes to the conclusion that the existing patterns of coordination were inadequate. "It is clear to a disturbing degree that . . . existing means have not achieved the co-ordination of the government in foreign affairs. They are at best a patchwork accepted in hope by officials who are reluctant to reconstruct the whole edifice." (p. 150)

McCamy finds that the most obvious solution to the problem of coordination would be to make the Department of State "the central and only authority in the field of foreign affairs, the President requiring consistently that all other agencies defer to State on all aspects of foreign relations." (p. 153) He also finds that this is the most improbable of the solutions.

The workable solution, McCamy believes, is to create in the Executive Office of the President a staff, "which would draw into the formulation of both foreign and domestic policy the various competences and interests and which would make sure that all agencies followed the President's policy in their activities." (p. 155) The proposed staff would not be made up of experts in subject matter fields but would rely upon the agencies for specialized knowledge. The staff would "stimulate the consideration of new ideas"; it would look to the departments for views and proposals on the aspects of foreign policy with which they are concerned. "The coordinated foreign policy . . . would come from the Office of the President." The execution of the policy would be

³ See Walter Laves and Francis O. Wilcox, "Organizing the Government for Participation in World Affairs," 38 *American Political Science Review* 913-30 (October, 1944); and Arthur W. Macmahon, "The Future Organizational Pattern of the Executive Branch," 38 *American Political Science Review* 1179-91 (December, 1944).

Herbert Feis, in *Seen from A. E.* (Alfred A. Knopf, 1944), contributed significant studies of difficulties resulting from the organization of the war period.

⁴ See General O. L. Nelson, *Report on the Organization of the Department of State* (processed for the department, 1946); and Arthur W. Macmahon, *Memo-randum on the Postwar International Information Program of the United States* (Government Printing Office, 1945), particularly Parts VIII and IX.

⁵ 92 *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 217-27.

⁶ House Select Committee on Foreign Aid, 89th Cong., 2d sess. (1948), H. R. 1845.

⁷ *Administration of U. S. Aid for a European Recovery Program* (January 1948). The problem of the importance of the administration of foreign affairs was recognized at the Brookings Institution Seminar at Hanover in the summer of 1947, and as a result an appendix dealing with the problem was included in *Major Problems of United States Foreign Policy, 1948*. The appendix was revised and published as a pamphlet, *Governmental Mechanism for the Conduct of United States Foreign Relations* (Brookings Institution, 1949).

⁸ The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, *Foreign Affairs; Task Force Report on Foreign Affairs* (Appendix H) (Government Printing Office, 1949). Particularly valuable are the mimeographed staff studies and papers of the foreign affairs task force.

the responsibility of the agencies involved. While alluding to the National Security Council as being perhaps the rudimentary form of such a staff, McCamy does not believe that the present council is the model for a presidential staff.

With painstaking care the author has made a detailed study of both the field and Department of State personnel. He finds that responsible officials in the Department of State have had far too little experience in the department. He also finds that "relatively few Foreign Service Officers . . . can be called experts in particular areas of the world." (p. 352) Nevertheless it is the Foreign Service Officers who long have dominated the "political affairs divisions" and thus shape policies directed to areas.

The Administration of Foreign Affairs and Overseas Operations, a report prepared for the Bureau of the Budget by the Brookings Institution, is by far the most exhaustive and thorough inquiry into the "administration" of foreign affairs.⁹ The Brookings study undertook the following assignment: (1) to determine the basic structure of organization in the executive branch most suitable for the conduct of foreign economic programs; (2) to review the responsibilities of the Department of Defense in the field of foreign affairs and to determine the relationships it should accordingly maintain with other foreign affairs agencies; (3) to determine the functions that should be performed by the Department of State in the

operation and coordination of foreign programs; (4) to determine the manner in which the United States Government should be represented in foreign countries, and the relationships of United States officials in each country to the chief of the diplomatic mission in that country; (5) to determine the kind of personnel administration that is needed for the recruitment and retention of the overseas civilian staffs essential to the foreign affairs programs; (6) to determine when and how the interdepartmental committee should be used in preference to other coordinating devices in the administration of foreign affairs activities requiring special emphasis upon interdepartmental coordination. (pp. xv, xvi)

The close connection between defense problems and foreign policy requires a high degree of coordination and mutual understanding between the Departments of State and Defense. The report points to the National Security Council as the logical place for joint work of the two departments on matters of "national security and grand strategy." The creation of the interdepartmental International Security Affairs Committee, as the device for coordination of agency work with respect to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and mutual defense problems, is endorsed by the report and a continuance of the system recommended.

While the Brookings study excludes the problem of internal organization of the Department of State it points out that this problem would deserve detailed study if basic agreement emerged regarding the functions to be performed by the Department of State. The idea that the Department of State should not have responsibility for the operation of any specific foreign program was rejected. The report rejects the suggestion of a new administration of overseas affairs to administer all overseas programs other than diplomatic and consular services. It also holds that foreign programs should not be administered by agencies whose primary responsibility is domestic. It recommends that the administration of a "unified program of military and economic aid" be carried out jointly by the Departments of Defense and State and the Economic Cooperation Administration. It recommends a closer relation between the country missions of ECA and the diplomatic missions. It suggests that the

⁹ The inquiry was directed by Leo Pasvolksy, director of the international studies group, and Paul T. David, senior staff member of the group in direct charge of the project. To assist its regular staff, the Institution added the following special personnel for the purposes of the study: Robert H. Connery, largely responsible for Chapter V, "The Department of Defense and the Conduct of Foreign Affairs"; Grace L. Guill; H. Field Haviland; Charles S. Hyneman; John F. Meck; Carroll F. Miles; J. Clayton Miller; Dale Noble; Wilfred Owen, largely responsible for Chapter IV, "Organization for the Conduct of Foreign Economic Programs"; Earl L. Packer, who worked on Chapter VII, "Representation in Foreign Countries"; Norman J. Padelford; Seymour J. Rubin, largely responsible for Chapter IX, "Coordination through Interdepartmental Committees"; Wallace S. Sayre, who was responsible for Chapter VIII, "Personnel Administration for Overseas Civilian Staffs"; Helen Semmerling; Herman M. Somers; Edward M. Thompson; Clarence F. Thurber, largely responsible for Chapter VI, "The Role of the Department of State in Program Operation and Coordination"; Maximilian Wallach; Wesley W. Walton; and Robert J. Wilson.

existing arrangements regarding military staffs abroad be continued.

The study indicates that the question of establishing a permanent organization for the administration of foreign economic programs can not be "wisely settled at this time" and that the organization for this purpose must be determined on a short-range basis. It concludes that ECA should continue as an emergency agency but that the date of its termination (July 1, 1952) should be removed. In addition, the report spells out the activities with which ECA should be charged.¹⁰ The Department of State should be responsible for (a) leadership in the formulation of economic foreign policy, and (b) the coordination of economic foreign policy with general foreign policy. Leadership in securing the coordination of foreign and domestic policy is a responsibility which should be centered in the Executive Office of the President.

Wallace Parks, in his *United States Administration of Its International Economic Affairs*, has written an analysis of United States government structure concerned with the administration of foreign economic programs. The author points out that prior to World War II the structure of the government was "domestic in orientation." This fact made it necessary to improvise for the purpose of the war and improvisation has continued to shape the pattern of government in the foreign economic field. Throughout the volume the author is concerned with "realigning" the functions of the various departments and agencies so as to make the administration of foreign economic programs more effective. To remedy what he believes is an ineffective administrative pattern, he suggests: "(1) increased emphasis to assigning responsibilities on the basis of functional social activity . . . and to a general clarification

tion of agency roles, (2) the development of a limited joint responsibility, including some features of a cabinet system within the executive branch, (3) the building of a consent relationship between the Congress and the executive branch on foreign economic problems and programs based upon adequate delegation of legislative powers and improved methods within the Congress for providing impetus to and review of executive action" (pp. 293-94).

The first objective he thinks can be met by reassignment of functions among agencies. The second objective he seeks in better coordination between executive agencies. Here he recommends some basic changes in the interdepartmental committee structure. "The tendency on the part of agencies to set up their own committees rather than to use existing committees should be held in check by a tighter screening of committees by the Budget Bureau." (p. 306) He feels that committee membership should be limited to agencies and offices principally concerned.

The most important proposal with respect to coordination is the suggestion for the creation of an international economic council for the promotion of inter-agency collaboration. Differences not reconciled within the council, or between the agencies concerned, would go to the President or to a presidential coordinator. Such a council would not, he feels, constitute a subgroup of the National Security Council but would tend to become the economic counterpart of the NSC.

Mr. Parks finds that such a Cabinet level committee as he suggests could be brought about through an extension of the powers of the present National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems (NAC). He believes that the State Department should provide the chairman for the proposed international economic council (IEC).

III

Two major areas have been of general concern to those who have worked on the administration of foreign policy. The first of these is the area of foreign economic policy and the second is that of personnel administration in the foreign policy field.

The organizational problems in the field of economic foreign policy have been trouble-

¹⁰ These include: (a) completion of the European recovery program; (b) economic aspects of the mutual defense program and of its proposed successor the mutual security program; (c) aid to Southeast Asia and the Philippines as well as other economic assistance programs currently being administered by it; (d) technical assistance, including the Point IV program, currently being administered by the Technical Cooperation Administration of the Department of State and the Institute of Inter-American Affairs; (e) procurement of strategic materials abroad; (f) export controls; (g) the foreign claimancy function.

some from the time the Economic Defense Board was constituted in 1941. In the war period, the existence of the Board of Economic Warfare, and later the Foreign Economic Administration, as independent agencies gave rise to problems of coordination with respect to economic foreign policy.

When Congress decided to create an independent agency to administer the Marshall Plan, the old problems of coordination were once more brought to the fore. The ECA Act attempted to meet the problem by requiring that the administrator of ECA and the Secretary of State must reach agreement and failing it they must submit disputes to the President for resolution.

The growth of the Department of State since the war has meant the adding of technical economic staffs which appear to duplicate existing staffs in other departments and agencies. This has given rise to friction and to the demand that the Department of State be limited in its functions to the issuance of "foreign policy directives" to the economic agencies.

In March, 1950, President Truman requested Gordon Gray to undertake a study with a view to determining the nature of foreign economic programs that should be adopted in order to promote sound economic development on the part of other states. The Gray report, submitted on November 10, 1950,¹¹ made one recommendation respecting the type of organization that should be created. "An agency or organization should be established within the United States Government to administer foreign economic programs. Its functions should include the administration of all grant and technical assistance programs (except the provision of military equipment) and the administration of other related activities, such as the stimulation of needed materials production abroad."

In December, 1950, the President approved a memorandum agreement between ECA and the Departments of Defense and State which strengthened the leadership of State in the foreign assistance programs and fixed more definitely the roles of the Department of Defense and ECA. It was this agreement that created the International Security Affairs Com-

mittee and resulted in the appointing of a director of international security affairs in the Department of State.

The Rockefeller report,¹² submitted to the President on March 11, 1951, seemed to endorse the recommendation of the Gray report. The Rockefeller group found that one unified agency "with a new point of view" was needed. It recommended that the Economic Cooperation Administration and the Technical Cooperation Administration and the Institute of Inter-American Affairs (the last two in the Department of State) be absorbed by the new agency. The report held that the problems of economic defense and economic development were inseparable and must be functions of the one agency.

Paul Hoffman, in his little volume *Peace Can Be Won*, urgently recommended that "an Overseas Economic Administration be formed to administer all aid and technical assistance programs abroad; that this administration have a large measure of control over the policy of such lending agencies as the Export-Import Bank; that the United States representatives to all international economic organizations be responsible to it; and that this administration have equal rank with the other departments of the government."¹³ The agency would take over the functions of ECA, the Point IV program of the Department of State, and the economic side of the Mutual Defense Program. Moreover, he would give to it policy directive power over United States representatives in the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and all other international bodies dealing with the world economy.

Such recommendations went far beyond the steps recommended by McCamy or Parks. The Brookings Institution study recommends that ECA be continued as an emergency agency but that it be given additional responsibilities. The study indicates that in the future it may be necessary to decide between a permanent department of foreign economic affairs and the concentration of economic programs in the Department of State. It points out that a further organizational possibility for the future might be the establishment of a new depart-

¹¹ Report to the President on Foreign Economic Policies (Government Printing Office, 1950).

¹² *Partners in Progress: Report of the International Development Board* (Government Printing Office, 1951).

¹³ *Peace Can Be Won* (Doubleday & Co., 1951), p. 57.

ment of foreign affairs, modeled somewhat on the pattern of the Department of Defense, with a department of foreign economic affairs as one of a number of subordinate administrative departments. (pp. xv, xvi) But for the present it feels that ECA should continue as an emergency agency.

In his message to Congress on May 24, 1951, President Truman submitted a "mutual security program" which would bring together the military assistance program, the economic assistance program, and the program of economic aid to underdeveloped areas. In submitting his "single-package program," the President indicated that the Department of Defense would administer military aid programs and ECA would carry on the economic assistance program for Western Europe, most of the Middle East, Africa, and Southeast Asia. Left unsettled was the administration of economic aid programs in Latin America and the technical assistance programs.

The House Committee on Foreign Affairs held hearings on H.R. 5020 and H.R. 5113 (the mutual security program) from June 26 to August 31, 1951,¹⁴ and on August 14 reported the bill.¹⁵ Title V, as recommended by the committee and passed by the House, establishes a mutual security administration which would be assigned functions performed by ECA, the Technical Cooperation Administration, and the Institute of Inter-American Affairs as well as certain functions assigned in the Mutual Defense Assistance Act, the Greek-Turkish Act, the Act of International Development.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations held hearings from July 26 to August 9, 1951,¹⁶ and reported the bill on August 27.¹⁷ The Senate version, as recommended by the committee and passed by the Senate, left the operation of the programs with the present

agencies. Senate amendments transferred the responsibility for coordination, by Executive order now vested with the International Security Affairs Committee of the Department of State, to the Executive Office of the President and provided that no person in any way connected with the coordination may at the same time be in any way connected with another department or agency of the government.¹⁸

The Joint Conference Committee reported September 27, 1951, approving the House principles and recommending the creation of the new mutual security administration.¹⁹ This is the provision made in Title V, Public Law 165, approved October 10, 1951.

Slowly the political decisions have been in the direction of creating an independent operating agency to handle foreign economic policy and allied functions. The trend has not reached the stage of a permanent agency. Nor can it be said that the steps taken have finally answered the questions of the proper administrative organization and the most workable methods of coordination. Many problems remain for public administration experts to solve.

IV

THE second important problem of concern to those interested in the administration of foreign policy is personnel administration. As an aspect of this problem there is the recurring question as to whether the Department of State and Foreign Service services should be merged.

The Hoover Commission recommended the amalgamation of the permanent State Department personnel and the personnel of the Foreign Service over a short time into "a single foreign affairs service obligated to serve at home or overseas" and constituting a "career group administered separately from the general Civil Service."²⁰ The commission's task force found that the "cancerous cleavage" between the Foreign Service and the Department Service had made the Foreign Service too independent of the department and had resulted in duplicate administration. Support for the commission recommendation lies in the fact that of thirty-four governments studied only

¹⁴ *The Mutual Security Program: Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st sess. (H.R. 5020 and H.R. 5113).*

¹⁵ *Mutual Security Act of 1951: Report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H. R. 5113, H. Rep. No. 872, 82d Cong., 1st sess.*

¹⁶ *Mutual Security Act of 1951: Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services on S. 1762, 82d Cong., 1st sess.*

¹⁷ *The Mutual Security Act of 1951: Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on the Armed Services on H. R. 5113, S. Rep. No. 703, 82d Cong., 1st sess.*

¹⁸ Conference Committee Print, *Showing the Differences between the Mutual Security Act (H.R. 5113) as It Passed the House and the Senate Amendment.*

¹⁹ *New York Times*, Sept. 28, 1951.

²⁰ *Foreign Affairs*, pp. 61-68.

five were found to have separate foreign services.²¹

McCamy found the task force "penetrating in its insight and firm in its proposed solutions." He pointed out that Foreign Service officers would oppose such a change because of their contention "that a separate career is essential to obtain the discipline needed for unpleasant assignments." (pp. 224-25)

An act of 1949 made the director general of the Foreign Service a staff adviser to the Secretary of State, thus giving the department direct authority over the Foreign Service. The Secretary placed one director over the two personnel offices. This was the major change resulting from the Hoover Commission recommendation.

In December, 1949, the Secretary of State appointed the so-called Rowe Committee to advise him "whether fundamental changes are required in the personnel systems and relationships of the Department of State and the Foreign Service." Even prior to the appointment of the Rowe Committee, a Department of State task force had been working on the problems involved in the Hoover Commission recommendation. The Rowe Committee recommended that "there should be a single personnel system applicable to all people under the direct administrative control of the Secretary of State."²² The recommended unified system would consist of (a) alien employees, (b) consular agents, and (c) employees in the foreign affairs service: (1) foreign affairs officer group and (2) foreign affairs clerical and technical group.

The other nineteen recommendations of the committee dealt with how the new foreign affairs service should be established. The new service would be separate from the civil service; it would be flexible so as to permit lateral transfer of both specialists and administrators in middle and higher grades; transferability would be made possible by a single system for salary, leaves, and retirement.

Although submitted to the Secretary of State on July 30, 1950, the report was not released

until April 16, 1951.²³ During the intervening nine months there was much consultation within the department and among Foreign Service officers. There was some discussion in the House and the Senate in March regarding the delay on the part of the department in implementing the Hoover Commission recommendation for a unified Foreign Service. A resolution was introduced in the Senate on March 15, 1951, requesting the Secretary of State to submit a plan to Congress within ninety days.²⁴ It may be that the congressional debates and the introduction of the resolution forced action by the department.

On April 16, 1951, the Secretary of State released his directive. Its purpose is "to improve the personnel systems and personnel management of the Department and Foreign Services." While the directive "stems from the findings and recommendations" of the Rowe Committee, it "does not at this time go as far as the program recommended by the Committee."²⁵ The changes provided for in the directive are primarily administrative in character. The emphasis is placed upon greater interchange of personnel between the department and the Foreign Service; upon recruitment of specialists into the Foreign Service officer corps; upon the more extensive use of the Foreign Service reserve; and upon improved personnel administration.

"The basic recommendation of the Hoover Commission and the Rowe Committee, the creation of an integrated foreign affairs service, has thus (for the time being) been rejected by the Department. The program accepted by the Department represents a limited and partial series of steps toward possible future integration of the two services, but the context within which these steps are to be taken (namely, emphasis upon the Foreign Service Personnel system, especially its officer corps) creates the

²¹ Released with the report were a summary of the committee recommendations and a *Directive to Improve the Personnel Program of the Department of State and the Unified Foreign Service of the United States*. See also *An Analysis of the Personnel Improvement Plan of the Department of State*, prepared for the use of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs by the Department of State, Committee Print, 84d Cong., 1st sess.

²² Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 19.

²³ *Directive to Improve the Personnel Program of the Department of State*, p. 1.

²⁴ Task Force Report, Appendix VII-B.

²⁵ James H. Rowe, Jr., Robert Ramspeck, and William E. DeCourcy, *An Improved Personnel System for the Conduct of Foreign Affairs* (Department of State, August, 1950), p. 11.

equally strong possibility that the two services will become more rigidly separated rather than integrated. If this should develop, the Department will not merely have rejected the goal of integration; it will have moved sharply in the opposite direction."²⁸

The need for further steps with regard to the integration of overseas personnel is clearly brought out in the Brookings study. The present personnel for overseas staffs is pictured as "a patchwork composed of a mixture of traditional personnel policies and of extemporized temporary personnel systems developed under emergency conditions." (pp. 292-93) There are six different systems of personnel administra-

²⁸ Brookings Institution, *op. cit.*, p. 300.

tion now in use, with the expected chaos resulting. Some change must be brought about.

Many of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and the Rowe Committee could be achieved through administrative action, but necessary steps can be taken only if positive leadership is forthcoming. Other steps will require legislation and the proposals for such legislation will be developed only if responsibility for such a program is fixed. For these reasons, the Brookings study recommends appointment, in the Executive Office of the President, of an administrative assistant assigned, for the next one to three years, for the purpose of working intensively on foreign affairs personnel administration.

Servant of a Purpose

By Herman Finer, University of Chicago

FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE: 1820-1910, by Cecil Woodham-Smith. McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1951. Pp. 382. \$4.50.

I

FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE began by nursing members of her family. She went on to managing a home for elderly and sick gentlewomen. Her activity was extended to the training of nurses. She commanded the first group of army nurses, this during the Crimean War, at Scutari, and became the Lady with the Lamp. She saw that those who enlisted in the British Army of that time enlisted "to death in the barracks"—not by the infliction of the enemy, but by sickness, and that sickness was remediable. She demonstrated it, and expanded her compassion to the total welfare of the British Army. She found that the organization and mentality of the War Office obstructed the practicable reforms that would give the soldier a better deal in sickness and in service. She therefore secured a reform of the War Office, the department most entrenched in reaction. She aided the North in the establishment of its hospitals and nursing services during the Civil War, with the fruits of her mind and experience, through the Secretary of War and

Dorothy Dix. She reformed the design of hospitals everywhere. Her energies were invested in the health of the Army in India, then in the health of all India, and later in the irrigation and drainage of India.

She produced two new types of humanity out of two old and ugly types: the British soldier and the hospital nurse. The first came no longer to be regarded as a drunken lout, dissolute, disappointed in civil life, and unregenerate; but a decent man, with a need for and delight in innocent recreation, the opportunity of saving his money, and an interest in education and public affairs. The second was converted from a depraved and incompetent slattern into a person of character and devotion made useful and competent by selection and proper training and the inculcation of a sound frame of mind.

All this catalogue of achievement, this successful operation on living society, so that it could never go back to its old ways, was accomplished by one woman practically single-handed. Her influence, her spirit, and her teachings revolutionized nursing and nursing administration over the whole world. To this day, the nurses' equivalent of the Hippocratic oath is the Florence Nightingale pledge,

though not composed by her but by others in her image. To this day, forty years after her death, and nearly one hundred since her most radical intervention began, hospitals and nurses work and struggle with her resolute and austere principles.

One person! One lifetime! And all this administrative creation was effected in but a very short number of years of actual administrative responsibility, most of it centered in her sick room, to which, largely as the result of sharing in the cholera-type sickness of "my" soldiers in the Crimea and the terrible struggle of her passion against the reactionary Ministers, she was confined from about 1857 to the end of her life.

How was it done? This is the question Mrs. Cecil Woodham-Smith has answered, not as a Ph.D. in administration might pose and answer it, but simply by telling her life, from all the papers now fully available, and Florence Nightingale's own notes and diaries, thousands of them, more than fully available. This is the kind of biography that those interested in the science of administration sorely need, though the earlier "official" one, by Sir Edward Cook, happens to dwell more on administrative detail. Not that the present work by any means neglects this area. Far from it; and that is what gives the present work its special importance for the students of the *Review*. It fully meets the complaints that were made some years ago that the articles on notable American administrators sounded too much like Horatio Alger stories. Florence Nightingale attained success, by pursuing the Good, but through very un-Algerian paths.

II

MY TEACHER, Graham Wallas, used to call the classic makers of British administration and political progress in the nineteenth century "administrative saints." What he meant was that these men and women, Bentham, Chadwick, Sir Robert Peel, Elizabeth Fry, Octavia Hill, the Webbs, Florence Nightingale, and a certain score of others in the top flight, mastered their personal passions, directed their superb intellects, and dedicated themselves to social altruism, even as St. Francis, Father Joseph, St. Ignatius, and Luther, in days gone by, had transformed their crude pas-

sion and mind into spiritual ministrations. Bowing to Dr. Freud's specially tinted spectacles, it may be said that they harnessed their libido in the shafts of their super-ego, which, in the nineteenth century, was moral reform through social institutions. Yet Dr. Freud does not go anywhere so far, or deep, as Mrs. Woodham-Smith with Florence Nightingale.

Florence was not a frump: she was beautiful and charming. She was not devoid of wealth: she even spent her own money on activities the bill for which the government should have footed; for she often pitted her exchequer, not a great but an adequate inheritance and allowance from her family, against the Chancellor of the Exchequer—and won. She was not devoid of artistic talent or aesthetic feelings: she could dance, play, laugh, charm, and was a whiz at mathematics. She was not anemic or lacking in sex appeal: one man after another, and one woman after another, fell in love with her; and two of the most brilliant men in England courted her for years, until at last she said the final "no." And she had tremendous capacity for loving others. She did not, therefore, become an administrative reformer as a substitute or an "escape" (bad word!).

She united in her beautiful body tremendous passion and emotional power, a brilliant intellect, a philosophic spirit, and a conscience. Of these four forces, the passion and the conscience were dynamic and tremendous. It is hard without extensive quotation to convey the strength, indomitability, and fervor of the first; or the tenderness of the second. That passion caused her to fight her family for emancipation from the trivial life of the society girl in the Victorian age; to fly from her mother and sister to the outside world of endeavor and achievement; to fall into trances as she dreamed what might be, could she find the engaging channel for her energy and mind; never to surrender in an enterprise on which she was engaged ("Resignation: I have never understood the word!") until she was utterly beaten, and even then to act on the principle (in Latin) that while there was still something to be done, nothing was accomplished.

Her passion caused her to search for its exquisite object, the highest she could perform; not the highest available in an easy definition of available, but the highest capturable by

vigor, address, self-sacrifice, and the proper tactics, however difficult, to win moral and material support and enlist the skills she needed but did not possess. She was obliged to fight down her own ability to "shine" in society and to marry. She overcame all the weaknesses and debility of the bedridden by the force of her passion. She heard voices—she was "called" again and again at critical junctures. "Today I am 30 (she writes in her little black notebook)—the age Christ began his mission. Now no more childish things. No more love. No more marriage. Now Lord let me think only of Thy Will, what Thou wilt me to do. Oh Lord Thy Will, Thy Will."

Frustration brought her to the verge of madness, filled as she was with the knowledge of her power, and, soon, a sense of its precise use, but balked by the clamor of her mother and sister that she enjoy "home comforts." Her father sided with her.

Her conscience, if it needed a socially determined spur and a pattern of open-eyed altruism, began to be insistent from the time she met Sismondi, the Genevan-Italian agricultural economist, who was one of the earliest of the humanitarian protestants against the rigor of Adam Smith. Her conscience now rebelled at any misery and disease that were preventable or remediable by human effort. She was committed to a life of assault on sloth, laziness, dishonesty, and official smugness. The onset of the "hungry forties" in England sharpened her worries over the sufferings of man. "What can an individual do towards lifting the load of suffering from the helpless and miserable?" she asked Baron Bunsen in 1842. His answer, that she might look in at Kaiserswerth, on the Rhine, where Protestant deaconesses were trained to nurse the sick poor, became soon the seed of her great life; and Dr. Ward Howe (whose wife composed the "Battle Hymn of the Republic" some years afterward), visiting the Nightingales' home, gave her perhaps the decisive encouragement to "go forward" in the unconventional career for women of devoting herself to works of charity in hospitals.

III

FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE, it must be confessed, was never educated in semantics or communications. She merely brought to bear a

powerful natural mind nourished and exercised on literature, philosophy, languages, history, Latin and Greek, and mathematics. These she was taught thoroughly, and at home. It is not surprising that, gifted with natural insight into human character, she was able to think accurately and analytically, to plan methodically, to organize purposefully, and to express herself unmistakably in good, clean-cut, incisive English. She was successful in all these functions—fabulously successful—without the assistance of either of the two forms of besetting gobbledygook: administrative or psychoanalytical. She was obliged to work through other people, and mainly through men. One of these, not so humorously, referred to himself as "one of your wives."

She bullied, wheedled, appealed to nobility, frightened (by using her public prestige against the timid), was objective with the helpful, worked all to death as she worked herself. For her spirit said: "Now had I lost the Report what would the health I should have 'saved' have profited me, or what would the ten years of my life have 'advantaged' me exchanged for the ten weeks this summer?" She was referring to her report of the first Royal Sanitary Commission on the Health of the Army, 1857, which she wrote practically single-handedly, and, as a result, to a breakdown of her health so serious that her obituaries were prepared for the newspapers. She lived for some thirty years after that date, mainly because, as she said, "Reports are not self executive," and her passion and her conscience exploited her physique in order to make her ideas change other people's behavior.

The reader must himself go to this well-knit, cogent narrative for the account of the simultaneous development of Miss Nightingale and British administration. There are great written works to her credit: like the *Notes on Hospitals* and the *Notes on Nursing*, and half a dozen government reports and thousands of pages of testimony given by memoranda before Royal Commissions. It will be interesting here, perhaps, if some of her administrative behavior, in action or in words, is indicated.

She subordinated her libido to her purpose. Her integrity and honesty were flawless. It took time for her to find the object of her personal identification; but she did, and then

stayed with it. She learned from others that it was possible for men and women to work together, be warm friends, and yet exclude the snares of sex: in other words she faced and solved the problem of the toughest "primary group" that Nature has established, the grouping of male and female. So identified was she with her purpose, and so conscious of the process of identification and its meaning, that without any study of textbooks on public administration, and without a single course in "human relations," she learned to treat colleagues and subordinates with the coolness (some said, the coldness) of a law of nature, under whose aegis she also served. And this was accomplished by a person of passionate and rebellious nature. Her warmth to the individual was subsumed within the cool lines of the administrative pattern seeking fulfillment of the stated purpose.

She appreciated the need for the transmission of passion, conscience, and talent of a superior order to a succession of people in administration with more ordinary and pedestrian qualities. This implied training—not just the assimilation of rules and regulations, but the stimulation of all the faculties needed for the purpose, and the formation of the kind of *character* the administrative end required. What is now called a performance evaluation record was filled in monthly for each student nurse: the Moral Record had six subdivisions; the Technical Record, fourteen, each further subdivided into perhaps a dozen sub-subdivisions. She wanted to get inside their minds, if she could. She had to establish a new kind of character for nursing—for her trainees, or probationers, would become the teachers of others.

She cultivated perception, acute observation—that is awareness, the first principle of good administration. She taught the value of seeing the whole as the home of the detail, and of the telling detail as the particles that make the whole. She dedicated administration to *all*, regardless of creed; this was her first fight, and she won it. But others persisted in preferring their Church and their faith to a universal loving-kindness implemented by trained minds and secular charity.

She belived in gadgets, where they served; central purchasing; the testing of deliveries for quality and weight; all the tricks of leadership,

to sway minds by persuasion, the maneuver of forces, the stacking of committees, the coaching of witnesses, the use of her charm or "spell" (charisma to Max Weber!). She made statistics into "argumentative arithmetic" and was perhaps the first to use pictorial charts to demonstrate facts. She knew, or got to know, all the people with the power to help her, or who could offset those who, in the War Office, the Cabinet, the poor law administration, among the conservative medical men, thwarted her policies. She taught and practiced on the principle that the influence and the example of the leaders was more important than classroom lessons or sermonizing admonitions. She affirmed the doctrine of undivided authority in the line of operations, and the imperatives of immersion of the top administrators in the subject matter to be administered (the day-by-day operations in the field), and of constant awareness, scrutiny of results, and supervision—in other words, continuing responsibility. She herself had the most remarkable insight into the psychology of the sick, or, to generalize, the psychology of the person who is the subject of administration; and it was this, the authority of the situation, that delineated the form and processes of the authority of command—neither more nor less.

She was calm and self-possessed; eschewed personal praise and reputation; loved her fellow workers, and was most zealous for their welfare and due reward. She had the masterly good sense not to challenge the authority of the doctor in his own sphere; but to propose that in his administrative relationships that concerned patient care he bow to the obligations he ought to assume, including the recognition of the rightful sphere of the nurse during treatment. She valued women, not as a feminist does, but according to her quality as servant of a purpose. She did not believe in indiscriminate equality: people had their graded deserts according to their graded contributions. She was fastidious about good food, pleasant surroundings, incisive thinking, duty, and administration.

IV

HERE, then, is a study in administrative ethics, without it being so in strict intention. If we desire to understand the conditions of

probity in our public affairs, a great deal can be learned from this *Life*. Without a Nightingale's passion and conscience, however, and her utterly indefatigable capacity for work, what is must still go on being.

How easy, also, it would be to translate this lucid, vivid, and cogent narrative and exploration from English into the language of Freud, even though Freud warned those with vision not to use his terminology except in clinical situations like those in which he practiced. The author gives ample material for that harsh and knotted jargon: "call of God"; "I wish to die"; "I feel guilty"; trances; psychomatic occurrences and sickness; the refusal to marry; the pretense that all her patients or her soldiers were "her" children; her terms of endearment to her young nurses; her love of her father; her hysterics and breakdowns; her pet

owl and her six cats! How ample this cornucopia of material for solidification into dried, unswallowable lumps! What an opportunity to show that something—administration—is not something—administration, but that everything today is something else, and that analogizing argument from the Hawthorne experiment should replace brain-work on administration itself. The trouble with the "human relationshipites" is not that they side-step to look at irrelevant phenomena, but that they do not even think of going far enough, all the distance to understanding human nature. Mrs. Cecil Woodham-Smith, unawaredly, by simply being intelligent and human herself, has, *apropos* of Florence Nightingale, given a splendid example of what an administrative biography can be, and the ends it can serve.

Contemporary Topics

Compiled by Public Administration Clearing House

Public Administration and Technical Assistance

Recommendations on the role of the United Nations in providing technical assistance in the field of public administration were completed during September by the Special Committee on Public Administration Problems, which was established last spring at the request of Hugh L. Keenleyside, director general of the Technical Assistance Administration.

As anticipated in the Summer, 1951, *Review* (p. 214) the recommendations include an outline for a survey of administrative conditions in a country requesting aid, to guide the TAA in evaluating its needs.

The establishment or improvement of training facilities in government organizations, including administrative management, finance, personnel, and planning and development, is also listed as a primary object. In this connection, the view is expressed that the UN could assist by making teachers available from other countries for limited periods and further by training local personnel who would, in turn, become teachers. Fellowships and scholarships are recommended for this group as well as for senior government officials.

The report recommends that expert consultant services in public administration should be available as a part of an adequate technical assistance program, and suggests that a small number of specialists be added to the staff for field work of this type. It is also recommended that missions with fairly wide scope should include a member to assist in formulating administrative recommendations for the requesting government, and that experts or missions with a particular job to do should be briefed on the administrative implications of their assignment prior to undertaking their work.

The recommendations of the committee have been referred to the newly organized Public

Administration Division of the UN Technical Assistance Administration. Chief of this division is H. J. Van Mook, former Acting Governor-General of Indonesia, whose appointment to this post was announced in September. Dr. Van Mook also acted as chairman of the Special Committee on Public Administration Problems. Serving with Dr. Van Mook in formulating the recommendations were Albert Lepawsky, professor of political science, University of Alabama; Jean-Louis Trouvé, deputy director, Directorate of Civil Service, France; Sir J. P. Srivastava, former member of the Government of India and member of Parliament; Rowland Egger, director, Bureau of Public Administration, University of Virginia and associate director, Public Administration Clearing House; Carlos Moran, director of the Law Department, City of Havana, Cuba; and Pedro Muñoz Amato, dean of the College of Social Sciences and Director of the School of Public Administration, University of Puerto Rico. Prior to heading this special committee, Dr. Van Mook had been visiting professor of political science, University of California, Berkeley.

UN Fellowships and Scholarships in Public Administration

Fellowships and scholarships in social welfare, economic development, and public administration constitute an important part of the UN expanded Technical Assistance Program. In the field of public administration, the UN fellowships enable member governments to send experts to countries having facilities for observation, higher training, or advanced study which can contribute to the betterment of public administration in the fellow's country. Fellowships, granted to experienced civil servants nominated by their governments, are from three to six months duration. Scholar-

ships, on the other hand, are usually given for a full year, to enable promising junior civil servants to study in academic institutions of more advanced countries those phases of public administration which, in their own countries, require development. Fellows receive primarily practical training, whereas scholars are given both practical assignments and academic training.

The total number of fellowships and scholarships made available between July 1, 1950, and May 31, 1951, was 750, of which 309 were awarded in 1950 and 441 in 1951. In the social welfare field, which received the largest number (376), all the awards were for fellowships. In economic development (249), all but 16 awards were for fellowships. In public administration, which received 125 awards, 90 were for fellowships and 35 for scholarships.

Recipients of the public administration awards included 14 persons from Europe, 25 from the Far East, 36 from the Middle East and Africa, and 50 from Latin America. Both the regional distribution of these awards and the large numbers of awards for scholarships appear to indicate recognition of the critical need for improvement in public administration operations in underdeveloped areas.

Of the 87 public administration awards recommended during the first part of 1951, 17 were for work in the U.S. (including Puerto Rico), 17 for work in the U.K. (including Cyprus, Jamaica, and the Sudan), and 10 were for fellowships in the Lebanon. Ten other nations—Canada, Mexico, Belgium, France, Brazil, Egypt, Australia, Switzerland, Sweden, and Denmark—were, in that order, hosts to from 6 to 1 fellows or scholars.

ECOSOC Studies of Local Fiscal Policy

Future ECOSOC studies of public fiscal policy as an instrument of economic stabilization will include consideration of local and provincial financial systems as the result of a resolution presented by the International Union of Local Authorities and adopted at the recent plenary session of the Council in Geneva. Thirteen member nations voted in favor of the resolution and three against—U.S.S.R., Poland, and Czechoslovakia. Canada and Peru abstained from voting.

In support of the resolution, the Indian delegate, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, pointed out that in his country services such as education and public health were supported by the provinces and cities as well as the federal government; thus it was impossible to have a complete picture of public expenditures without gathering data from all levels of government.

Other speakers in favor of the resolution emphasized that the study by the Council of public fiscal policy as an instrument of economic stabilization would be incomplete if it did not take into account the impact of local taxation and borrowing upon the economy. It was also pointed out that advisors sent by the UN to underdeveloped countries to discuss public finance and other problems of economic development often find that they are being asked to advise on problems of finance confronting local communities as a result of the shift from a rural to an urban economy in these countries.

Report of Technical Assistance Board

ECOSOC has issued the following publication, prepared for use in connection with Item 33 of ECOSOC's thirteenth session, Geneva, August-September, 1951: *Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance—Third Report of the Technical Assistance Board to the Technical Assistance Committee* (E/2054, July 19, 1951, 367 pp.). The contents are divided into four parts as follows: I, Summary Review of the Expanded Programme; II, Major Fields of Technical Assistance Activities; III, Summary of Technical Assistance Activities by Countries; IV, Administrative and Financial Aspects of the Expanded Programme. Published separately is Part V, *Proposed Activities during the Second Financial Period* (E/2054/Add. 1/Rev. 1, August 7, 1951, 13 pp.).

Worldwide Availability of UN Documents and Publications

UN publications and documents, as well as materials issued by the specialized agencies of the UN, are available to scholars and the general public all over the world through a system of "depository libraries" in which the UN and five of the specialized agencies deposit, without charge, copies of all their publications. These

deposits include not only printed books and periodicals, but also the much more numerous mimeographed documents which are likely to be of special interest to scholars and research workers. Last year, for example, more than 6,000 mimeographed items were issued by the UN alone. These included working papers, special reports, records of meetings, and other items, many of which never appeared in printed form.

Altogether there are 379 depository libraries located throughout the world. In the U.S., 46 libraries in 30 cities receive complete sets of materials issued by the UN or by one or more of the five specialized agencies. The names and locations of these depository libraries appear in the United Nations Documents Index, April 1951, Vol. 2, No. 4, Part 2, which may be ordered (\$0.75) from International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York City 27, (Sales No. ST/LIB/SER. E/19.)

International Seminar in Public Administration

The Brazilian School of Public Administration, organized by the Getulio Vargas Foundation in collaboration with the UN, will be opened in 1952.

The Brazilian government is making its contribution to the expanded program of technical assistance of the UN (see Winter, 1951, *Review*, p. 62) through the establishment of this school and through the contribution of funds and services in connection with the organization of a UN seminar on problems of general administration to be held in Rio de Janeiro in February, 1952. The draft proposal submitted to the UN notes that "it is becoming generally recognized that if the underdeveloped countries receiving technical assistance from the UN and the specialized agencies do not improve their administrative capacities, all the efforts that international organizations might make to aid them in accelerating their economic and social progress will be fruitless."

The Brazilian proposal undertakes to facilitate needed improvements. It also profits from the experience of the first UN seminar in the field of public administration, held in the winter of 1950-1951, which included members from nineteen countries all over the world. In

evaluating the effectiveness of this seminar, it was the consensus of participants as well as of those who had administered the program that public administration is at such varied stages of development in different areas that better results could be achieved through regional seminars in which all or most of the participants shared a common language and common traditions.

The total project, which is being organized by the Getulio Vargas Foundation under the direction of the UN and with the cooperation of UNESCO and of SENAC (Servico Nacional de Aprendizagem Commercial-National Service of Commercial Apprenticeship), includes a schedule of special courses in administration to be given from November, 1951, through March, 1952, the international seminar which will meet during February, 1952, and inauguration of the Brazilian School of Public Administration sometime during 1952.

The special courses will be offered to a group of about 100 public officials under 35 years of age selected from candidates presented by the federal and state governments of Brazil, the ten largest government corporations of Brazil, and the governments of other Latin American countries. Full and partial scholarships will be provided and certificates will be awarded to students successfully completing a final examination at the end of the course. Visiting professors from Brazil and other nations will conduct courses in principles of public administration, organization and methods, personnel administration, budget formulation and execution, and comparative administration. Among the U.S. scholars invited to participate are Roscoe Martin, Syracuse University; Henry Reining, Jr., University of Southern California; and Harvey Walker, Ohio State University.

The seminar in February will be conducted as a separate activity, but in view of the close relationship between the subject matter covered by the two programs the students of the special courses and the professors conducting these courses will participate in the discussions of the seminar. The general subject of the seminar is the organization, direction, and functioning of the auxiliary services and staff agencies of public administration.

The seminar members will be specialists of

recognized standing, three from Brazil and eighteen from other nations. They will operate as a round table, meeting daily for a month, and will base their discussions upon a group of documents assembled through the UN. It is expected that these papers and other documents prepared for the seminar and for the special courses will ultimately be used as training material in the Brazilian School of Public Administration.

IIAS Reports for the UN

The International Institute of the Administrative Sciences has completed the following reports, undertaken by its Committee on Administrative Practices, under contract, for the United Nations:

1. *Issues and Problems in the Administrative Organization of National Governments*, by Arnold Miles and Alan L. Dean, 1950, 39 pp.
2. *Guide pour l'Établissement d'un Statut du Personnel des Administrations Civiles de l'État*, par J. P. Guinot, J. Isaac-Georges, et R. Letrou sous la direction de Roger Gregoire, 1951, 175 pp.
3. *Central O & M Offices—What They Do and Where They Are*, by Arnold Miles, 1951, 20 pp.
4. *The Central Machinery of Government: Its Role and Functioning*, by Ralph J. Burton assisted by Edward B. Strait, 1951, 51 pp.
5. *Improvement of Organization and Management in Public Administration—A Comparative Study*, by Thomas Doyle Kingdom (printed together with a summary of replies furnished by national governments and international organizations to a questionnaire on the same subject), 1951, 149 pp.
6. *Handbook on Secretarial Practice*, by the Civil Service Commission of Canada, 1951, 20 pp.
7. *Handbook of Organization and Methods Techniques*, by H. O. Dovey, 1951, 47 pp.
8. *Some Human Aspects of Administration*. Chapters I-V, and Chapter VII are written by Rolf Wattne, head of the Department for Supervisory Training, Institute of Technology, Oslo; Chapters VI, VIII, and IX were prepared by staff members of the O & M Division, Ministry of Finance, Norway.

The Preface is signed by Hartvig Nissen, director. 1951, 140 pp.

Inquiries regarding these reports should be addressed to the headquarters of the IIAS, 17 Place des Martyrs, Brussels or to the Technical Assistance Administration, United Nations, East 42d St., New York City.

College of Europe Appointment

Arthur N. Holcombe, professor of government, Harvard University, has accepted an appointment as professor of federal administration at the College of Europe, Bruges, Belgium, for the second and third terms in 1952. A brief account of the program of the College appeared in the Summer, 1951, *Review*, p. 213.

Scientists in the Foreign Service

Announcement was made during the summer of the appointment by the Department of State of several American scientists who are to serve as science attachés in London, Stockholm, and Bern.

These appointments are in line with recommendations made in a report, *Science and Foreign Relations*, prepared at the request of the Department of State under the direction of Lloyd V. Berkner, formerly on the staff of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, now president of Associated Universities, Inc. The report proposed establishment of an office of science adviser in the department and of science staffs in important United States foreign missions to keep the department informed of scientific and technological developments abroad affecting our foreign policy.

The recommended post of science adviser was established and filled last February by the appointment of Joseph B. Koepfli, who was granted a leave of absence from the California Institute of Technology to accept this assignment. Seven attachés have been appointed to the overseas staffs, and it is expected that other posts will be filled soon.

In making these appointments, the department is experimenting with an idea which is receiving increasing attention among those who are concerned with the problem of securing for the government the services of specialized personnel from industry and the academic

world. In this instance, it was believed that the top positions could best be filled by working scientists sufficiently familiar with current developments to report intelligently on similar activities in other countries. Such men are generally attached to research departments in universities or industry and are unwilling to give up their tenure in these positions. However, it is frequently possible to secure their services as Foreign Service reserve officers for periods of a year to a year and a half, and that is what the department is doing.

Although the program and the attaché positions are permanent, membership in these staffs is temporary and rotating. Continuity is maintained by the appointment of assistant science attachés for longer periods, and by overlapping tenures.

Federal Personnel Council

The Federal Personnel Council, which operates within the framework of an Executive order as an advisory body to assist the President, the Civil Service Commission, and other agencies of the government in the development and application of basic personnel policies, has made a study of itself and decided on some procedural changes designed to make its work more effective. The study was made by a committee on organization, appointed by the chairman of the council last spring. Recommendations presented by the committee were adopted by the council in August.

The committee found evidence of a good deal of dissatisfaction among the members of the council on two counts: (1) the large number of committees, and (2) the amount of time spent around the council table on relatively unimportant subjects. Both of these situations prompted the member agencies to be represented frequently by second- and third-string alternates instead of by the directors of personnel as was intended when the council was established.

Under the new plan, the council will operate through a steering committee of not more than five persons who will be responsible for developing the long-range program of the council and will have general supervision over the council agenda. In addition, there will be four standing committees, each dealing with a

major area of personnel policy, and *ad hoc* committees as required for special studies. Representation at council meetings is to be limited to designated agency members or their regular alternates. In line with the establishment of this tighter organization pattern, an informal agreement has been reached between the chairman of the Civil Service Commission and the chairman of the Personnel Council to the effect that all major policy changes will be referred to the council at the earliest possible stage in their development so as to secure the advantages of full consideration by this group.

The committee considered the possibility of changing the organizational location of the council from the Civil Service Commission to the Executive Office of the President, but their report recommended a continuation of the present arrangement, noting that their action was in accord with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and the general trend toward strengthening the Civil Service Commission as the central personnel agency.

A separate set of recommendations dealing with the thirty-two councils in the field recommends that they adopt a similar pattern of committees and agency representation.

Federal Real Estate Tax Payments

A bill (H.R. 5223) providing for payments to state and local governments "in lieu of taxes" was introduced in Congress during the last session by Congressman Murdock of Arizona. The object of the proposed measure is to avoid, to the extent feasible, inequities in tax burdens between state-local and federal taxpayers arising from the acquisition or use of property by the federal government.

If federal property holdings were distributed more or less evenly over the country, the effects upon taxpayers in state and local jurisdictions would perhaps average out if no payments were made on any federal property. Federal property, however, tends to be concentrated in particular localities and frequently imposes inequitable burdens upon the taxpayers in those areas through reduction of the property tax base or through special requirements for local government service by federal agencies.

This is a problem of long standing and the

present bill is the result of discussions between federal and state and local government officials going back at least as far as the spring of 1949 when a conference arranged by the Secretary of the Treasury asked the Bureau of the Budget to take the lead in working out recommendations for legislation.

Formulation of standards that can be used throughout the government has been complicated by the tremendous variety of purposes for which the federal government owns and uses property. Classification of properties according to their use presents difficult problems, particularly for a bill which cannot enumerate all the individual kinds of properties or their uses but must rely upon a statement of broad standards and intentions.

Five general types of payment are authorized under the proposed bill and twenty existing laws providing for particular situations would be repealed. More specific rules and regulations to guide the property-owning agencies would be issued as administrative regulations by a commission consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Administrator of General Services, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The commission would establish an advisory committee of not more than twenty, which would include representatives of national associations of state and local governmental officials.

Federal Reorganization Proposals

Congress recessed without taking final action on any of the nineteen reorganization measures introduced last March at the instigation of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report (see Spring, 1951, *Review*, p. 145), although extensive hearings were held on a number of them and partial action was completed on some.

A good deal of favorable testimony was given in behalf of S.1135, providing for decentralization and improvement of personnel operations under civil service rules. One section, authorizing the use of category ratings instead of the present "rule of three" for the selection of people to fill high-level professional and scientific positions, aroused particular interest and has the strong support of the Civil Service Commission. The commission favors giving ap-

pointing officers the wider choice which this plan allows in the selection of such positions but they cannot authorize its adoption without congressional action amending the Veterans Preference Act. The Senate has acted favorably on this bill but no action had been taken by the House when Congress recessed October 20.

S.1149, relating to the organization and administration of the Department of Agriculture, contains several provisions similar to those of Reorganization Plan No. 4 which was submitted to the Congress by the President last year but which failed of adoption. These provisions correspond to changes already approved in other executive departments designed to strengthen the responsibility of department heads for the conduct of their organizations. Testimony on these sections of the bill was generally favorable but a considerable amount of controversy attached to certain additional features of the bill, notably those providing for the transfer to the Department of Agriculture of the land management functions of the Department of the Interior and the agricultural part of the vocational education program of the Office of Education. Exception was also taken to a section of the bill which prescribes in considerable detail the internal organization of the department. Secretary of Agriculture Brannan and a spokesman for the Bureau of the Budget appeared in opposition to this section as inconsistent with the idea of the responsibility of the executive.

Two of the measures passed the Senate but were recalled for further consideration—one creating a commission to study the administration of overseas activities of the government and one to establish a national commission on intergovernmental relations.

Management Improvement in States and Cities

While the "unfinished" portion of the Hoover proposals was stalled in Congress, various state and local activities moved ahead along the lines of federal recommendations already effective.

New York City, for the first time in years, was not in the market for steel filing cabinets—and the steel shortage had nothing to do with it. A document-by-document survey of two city departments had shown that 73 per cent of the

documents which had been put away for permanent storage could be discarded.

In Michigan, a similar survey by the state's "Little Hoover Commission" resulted in a recommendation that 25 per cent of the records being kept in expensive office space should go into low-cost storage in a general records center.

Stimulus for these and other similar surveys was the Hoover Commission's report on federal records and subsequent congressional action authorizing the General Services Administration to destroy government records no longer considered useful. Prior to the passage of this legislation, no government records could be destroyed without specific authorization by Congress.

Since the enactment of the new federal law, 900,000 cubic feet of records, or the equivalent of 150,000 full filing cases, have been stored in the National Archives. These are records that trained experts found worth saving in screening many times that quantity. The GSA has also set up federal record centers in Chicago, New York, San Francisco, and in Washington, D. C., to store records which are considered worth keeping. Some of these will be destroyed later on a prescribed schedule—one class of paper to be discarded after one year, another after two years, and so on.

The concept of performance budgeting—named if not originated by the Hoover Commission—is also spreading across the country. Detroit, Rochester, San Diego, Los Angeles, Berkeley, Kansas City, Wichita, Denver, Phoenix, and Richmond are among the cities which are moving in this direction.

In Richmond, where they are now operating under their second annual performance budget, the Vice Mayor presented the current budget proposal to the Council with an enthusiastic explanatory statement in which he contrasted the old-type detailed "line budget" with the performance budget which he described as "the very heart of our managerial government—the chief organ through which we achieve effective and efficient administration."

Census of Governments

The 81st Congress having enacted an amendment last year to the Census Act of 1902 re-

quiring that a complete census of governments be taken in 1952 and every five years thereafter, instead of every ten years as in the past (see Winter, 1951, *Review*, p. 68), the 82nd Congress has eliminated from the 1952 appropriation of the Department of Commerce all funds requested for this activity. This is a series of long standing and is the only comprehensive and comparative source of quantitative data on local, county, and state governments. A supplemental appropriation for this purpose will be requested when the Congress reconvenes in January. Pending further congressional action, however, the planning and staffing to get this census under way are necessarily at a standstill.

Recruiting Programs in the States

Competition from defense industry is forcing public service recruiting authorities in many states to make increasing use of continuous or "open" examinations and think up some new wrinkles to expand their lists of eligibles.

In Colorado, the civil service law limits appointments in the classified service to qualified electors. This has meant that the state was losing to private industry large numbers of young people just out of high school or business school who were under 21 years of age. Now the state is running an on-the-job training program for young people between the ages of 18 and 21 who are interested in government careers. When the trainees reach the age of 21, they are transferred to the classified service and given credit on their records for the period of their training experience.

In Iowa, a definite program of continuous examinations has been adopted in order to avoid the necessity for appointing people on a provisional basis who may have to be replaced after a few months as eligible lists are drawn. Iowa's continuous plan supplements rather than replaces the regular semi-annual examinations. The new scheme provides for intensified recruitment focused on a particular area, since under the regular examinations schedule some localities fail to turn up enough eligibles to meet their needs.

California is experimenting with a new interim examination schedule in one of its major shortage areas—county welfare positions.

Monthly supplemental examinations are being held in the areas where vacancies exist in an effort to fill all vacancies within ten days.

In Louisiana, wide publicity has been given to the monthly examination schedule for 1951 which lists 124 classes of jobs in the state service. An effort is being made to build eligible lists wherever possible so that the appointing authority will not find it necessary to make nonstatus appointments.

Pasadena's Annexation Fee

Pasadena officials have found a solution to the annexation problem which turns this common municipal headache into a straight business proposition. They charge a "joining fee" which helps pay for the extra water, electricity, and other service costs which, according to studies by the International City Managers' Association, generally amount to more during the first few years after annexation than the taxes paid by the new areas.

The fee is based on a formula which assesses \$100 for each 50 x 150 foot residential lot taken into the city and a charge of \$250 an acre for water and \$1.25 a foot for water mains on annexed land that is uninhabited. Property owners who cannot make payment in cash may retire their obligation over a period of years at rates fixed by the city.

Since the initiation of this plan in February, 1950, Pasadena has received \$108,675 from three unincorporated fringe areas annexed to the city and applications are pending from six other areas containing 14,000 people with an estimated joining fee amounting to \$903,900.

The need for an assured water supply has prompted many fringe areas around Pasadena to seek annexation during recent years—28 areas having joined the city during the five-year period 1945-49.

State Aid on Local Problems

States and cities are joining forces on some mutual problems which call for heavier financing than local resources can supply—school building programs and the maintenance of urban streets linking major highways between cities.

In Pennsylvania, local school districts were unable to finance needed new buildings or ex-

pand existing facilities, and the State, because of a constitutional restriction, was not able to borrow and extend credit directly to the districts. The impasse was broken by establishing the Pennsylvania State Public School Building Authority which is empowered to construct, improve, maintain, and operate school buildings and equip them for use. Upon approval of the State Department of Public Instruction, school districts may contract to lease the completed projects at a yearly rental to be determined by the state agency.

Similar authorities have been created during the past year in Georgia, Indiana, and Maine.

On the problem of highway aid for cities, the most common solution has been some form of sharing the state gas tax.

In Illinois a one-cent gas tax increase, effective last August, is distributed so as to increase by 25 per cent the share which cities receive from this source of revenue. An additional one-cent increase will go into effect in 1953.

A new Kansas law provides for cities to receive 20 per cent of any gas tax collections in excess of the \$4.5 million regularly allocated to the counties and cities of the state. More than \$800,000 in excess funds are anticipated this year.

In Wyoming an additional one-cent gas tax, approved this year, is to go 75 per cent to counties and 25 per cent to cities and towns.

Pennsylvania's 1951 legislature allocated \$12 million in gas tax funds to municipalities, to be divided 60 per cent on mileage and 40 per cent on population. An additional \$3 million was made available for matching grants to cities for road improvement.

Georgia Bureau of Public Administration

The University of Georgia has recently re-established its Bureau of Public Administration at Athens, Georgia. The bureau will take over the Public Administration Series which has been issued by the College of Business Administration at the university during the past few years. Emphasis will be placed upon the gathering of comparative data from Georgia municipalities, such as salaries of public officials, costs of various services, and charges for services rendered.

In cooperation with the Extension Division of the university and with other schools and

colleges in the state, the bureau will conduct schools and conferences for municipal officials and organize special training programs upon request. Advice and assistance on technical problems of administration and on the conduct of local surveys will be given by direct reference to members of the university staff or by putting the appropriate municipal officials in touch with outside experts.

The bureau is also assuming joint responsibility with the Georgia Municipal Association for publication of *The Georgia Local Government Journal*.

International Institute of Administrative Sciences

The Round Table of the IIAS, held in Nice and Monaco May 25-30, attracted over 150 participants from more than 25 countries and international organizations. The conception of the Round Table as primarily sessions of the committees of the Institute was strained by this large attendance, which converted the gathering into almost a moderate-sized congress. The Scientific Committee, under the chairmanship of Henri Puget of the Conseil d'État of France, discussed principally the role of the constitutional court in reviewing administrative action and the teaching of public administration and administrative law. It devoted several sessions to revising the draft of the questionnaire prepared by M. Puget, to serve as the basis of study and report by the national sections during the next several years, on the administration of public economic undertakings. The committee was encouraged by the issuance from the press of the general report based upon its previous study, in cooperation with UNESCO, of *National Administration and International Organization; A Comparative Survey of Fourteen Countries* (Available from Columbia University Press, New York City 27, \$0.50).

The Committee on Administrative Practices, under the chairmanship of Donald C. Stone of ECA, discussed topics such as the improvement of supervision in ministries, and administrative machinery to cope with economic development plans; it also considered its future plans of work and discussed a draft of a handbook on organization and methods techniques.

Gustavo Martinez-Cabañas, deputy director-general, Technical Assistance Administration,

UN, participated in a meeting of the Bureau of the Institute that agreed upon work plans for the coming year under the contract between UN and the Institute whereby the Institute furnishes documentation for the UN program in public administration. Hans Reschke, secretary of the German Institute of Public Affairs, similarly discussed the work that the Institute performs for the German Institute under a contract with HICOG.

The Bureau received with regret the resignation of Edmond Lesoir as secretary general, effective at the end of 1951. The Round Table paid warm tribute to his many years of devoted service. Paul Schillings of Belgium was named director of services at headquarters. The Bureau adopted a budget and plan of work for the coming several years which stresses the development of national sections, particularly in regions of the world now becoming increasingly concerned with improvement of administration. Plans were made to strengthen the facilities of the secretariat—a step made possible by the increased U.S. contribution from the American Society for Public Administration and Public Administration Clearing House.

The Round Table welcomed especially, as evidence of the spread of interest in the work of the Institute, the participation of Arizio de Viana, director general of DASP, Brazil; David Rosolio, deputy comptroller general of Israel; Count Sukhum, secretary general of the Civil Service Commission of Thailand; Dr. Stjepanovic of Yugoslavia; M. Desai of India; and Fouad Mohanna of Egypt.

The Institute accepted the invitation of the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg to hold a Round Table there in 1952 and authorized its officers to perfect arrangements in connection with the invitation of the government of Turkey to hold the next Congress in Istanbul in 1953.

Delegates from the U.S. included Herbert Emmerich and Rowland Egger of the Public Administration Clearing House; Donald C. Stone, William Hardy, Harry Fite, and John Russell of ECA; John Brown Mason of HICOG; and Charles S. Ascher, representative of the Institute at ECOSOC.

International Union of Local Authorities

The Tenth Congress of the IULA at Brighton, England, during the week of June

25, 1951, brought together over 335 municipal officials from 30 countries, including such outstanding figures as the mayor of Helsinki, E. Rydman; the mayor of West Berlin, Ernst Reuter; the mayor of Hamburg, M. Brauer; the vice mayor of Vienna, K. Honay; the mayor of Stockholm, C. A. Anderson; the vice mayor of Belgrade, Djurica Jokic; the leader of the London County Council, I. J. Hayward; and the mayor of Rotterdam, P. J. Oud, who was reelected president of the IULA. Delegates of the United States Conference of Mayors were Mayor D. L. Lawrence of Pittsburgh; Mayor F. Holcombe of Houston; Mayor A. B. Chambers of Des Moines; Mayor A. C. Thompson of Jackson, Mississippi; Mayor Dorothy McCullough Lee of Portland, Oregon; and Paul V. Betters, executive director. Others present from the U.S. were Herbert Emmerich, chairman, U.S. Committee for International Municipal Cooperation; Don F. Herrick, executive director, American Public Works Association; Alonzo G. Grace, School of Education, New York University; Wesley Gilbertson, U.S. Public Health Service; and Charles S. Ascher, representative of the Union at the UN.

The two principal subjects of discussion were "Local Authorities and Education" and "Local Water Supply and Sewage," upon which reports had been received from fifteen member unions, synthesized in general reports by E. W. Woodhead, education officer, Kent County Council, and A. Achten, chief engineer, Inter-municipal Water Company of Brussels. There was also a discussion of "Food and Drink Infection," chaired by Mr. Gilbertson. A panel of three—Charles S. Ascher, Herbert Abraham of UNESCO, and Herbert Bosch of WHO—led a discussion of the ways in which the programs of the UN and its specialized agencies involved local government and how municipal officials could aid in carrying out the work of the UN.

About 150 of the delegates were the guests of the Lord Mayor of the City of London at a luncheon at Mansion House. The Congress was received by the chairman of the London County Council. The mayor of Brighton was the host at a civic banquet. Numerous study tours were organized to visit installations in Sussex and the New Town of Crawley.

The keynote of the Congress was best expressed by the president of the conference,

Mayor P. J. Oud of Rotterdam. He asserted that the self-government of towns is one of the basic principles of democracy and warned against increasing centralization as a threat to local autonomy. He said this is demonstrated primarily in the field of finance, where central governments, faced with enormous postwar expenditures, are reluctant to share their revenue with the cities and at the same time do not permit the cities the power to raise their own revenues to reconstruct and to support the necessary municipal services. He recommended that the next Congress, which will be held in Vienna in 1953, concentrate on these topics as well as on the special problems of the large city and of the small town.

International Management Congress

Nearly 1,000 persons attended the Ninth International Management Congress in Brussels, July 4-12, organized by the International Committee for Scientific Management. A large delegation from the U.S. included leaders in the management world such as Lawrence A. Apple, president, American Management Association; Mrs. Lillian Gilbreth; Col. Clarence E. Davies, secretary, American Society of Mechanical Engineers; Erwin Schell of M.I.T.; Mrs. Mary Cushing Niles of the Federal Personnel Council; and Raymond Zimmerman of ECA. The Congress was conducted chiefly by panel discussions. The panel on Management Advances in Public Administration had as chairman the Finnish Minister to Belgium and as discussion leader Herbert Emmerich of the U.S.; it included Sir James Crombie of H. M. Treasury; Lyonel Wurmser of France; Charles S. Ascher of the U.S.; Abram Mey of the Netherlands; and members from Brazil, Italy, and Belgium. Among those taking part in the discussion were M. Desai of India; Wagner de Cunho of Brazil; E. B. Schumacher, civil service commissioner, Australia; John B. Atkinson, city manager, Cambridge, Mass.; and Louis Camu of Belgium.

The Congress employed simultaneous interpretation with IBM portable earphones and introduced for the first time the use of full panel discussion in an international meeting. The adoption of this device was a decided step forward in improving the technique of bilingual conference management.

The working paper had been prepared on behalf of the National Management Council by George H. Deming of the University of New Hampshire, with John H. Willard as rapporteur. The three central points of discussion were propositions submitted by the discussion leader concerning the budget, decentralization, and human relations. About 150 delegates attended the session on public administration.

Louis Cornil, director of the Federation of Belgian Industries, was elected president. The decision was taken to hold the Tenth Congress in São Paulo, Brazil, in 1954.

International Federation for Housing and Town Planning

The Eighth Meeting of the Council of the International Federation for Housing and Town Planning, held at Hoddesdon, about twenty-five miles from London, July 14-18, brought together about seventy-five representatives of constituent organizations of the Federation from fourteen countries, including Australia, South Africa, and Indonesia, as well as Western Europe. Participants from the U.S. were Harlean James of Washington; Martin Myerson of Chicago; and Charles S. Ascher, who sat for Walter H. Blucher in the thirteenth meeting of the Bureau and the seventh meeting of the Executive Committee.

Secretary-General H. van der Weijde reported that the headquarters had now been transferred to The Hague, in temporary quarters provided by the city at Bezuidenhoutseweg 75, pending completion in January, 1952, of the addition to the building of the International Union of Local Authorities at Paleisstraat 5, in which the two organizations will again be united, as they were at Brussels before the war.

Louis Scheffer, city planner for Amsterdam, was elected deputy president, a newly created office; Charles Prunard, president of the French Confederation for Housing and Urbanism, was elected Hon. Secretary in place of Lady E. E. Pepler, who had served for many years; F. J. Osborn of Welwyn Garden City was reelected Hon. Treasurer; and Hans Quidding of the

Royal Building Board of Sweden was elected to the Bureau.

The Council decided that the next Congress of the Federation should take place September 7-13, 1952. Both Vienna and Lisbon have issued invitations. The final selection is to be made by the Bureau at its meeting at the Hague on October 19, 1951.

Topics proposed for study and discussion include urban land policies; housing in tropical countries (a problem of great concern in underdeveloped countries); public control of private development; and the measurement of substandardness of housing. Plans were initiated for a possible regional conference in Southeast Asia in 1953, to extend the influence of the Federation to new areas.

The Hon. Treasurer outlined a campaign to increase support for the Federation, which at present has only a part-time secretary-general. Special efforts will be made during the coming year in Scandinavia, Benelux, and the U.S.A.

As usual, the business meetings were interspersed with study tours and lectures. J. H. Forshaw, chief architect to the U.K. Ministry of Local Government and Planning, and S. L. G. Beaufoy, director of technical services to the Ministry, described recent achievements in housing and planning in Britain. Hugh Casson, chief of design for the South Bank Exhibition of the Festival of Britain, outlined its development and Robert Matthew, architect to the London County Council, guided members through the magnificent new Festival Concert Hall. The Conference was received by the chairman of the London County Council at Council Hall.

Trips were made to the New Towns of Stevenage and Harlow, where the officers of the corporations and their chief planners and architects received the party. Mr. Osborn guided a tour of Welwyn Garden City. The Conference also inspected the redevelopment of the Lansbury Neighborhood Unit in the bombed-out area of the Borough of Poplar in East London, under the guidance of Frederick Gibbard, the chief planner, and visited the Architectural Exhibition of the Festival of Britain nearby.

ASPA Conference

March 7-9, 1952—Friday through Sunday

Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C.

*a top-notch study of
administrative history*

THE JEFFERSONIANS

by Leonard D. White

The brilliant author of *The Federalists* continues his studies of administrative history. Here he scrutinizes events from 1801 to 1829, showing how our infant government converted a paper constitution into a living reality. He delves into the story of the Presidency, the Treasury, the Army and Navy, the Post Office, and many other areas and shows the vital connection between the problems of the Jeffersonians and those of today. With its incorporation of original sources and lively, winning anecdotes, his book will interest every student of political science and public administration.

\$6.00

MACMILLAN





